



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





Soc 1685.90



Harvard College Library

FROM

Hon. Wm. S. Kenyon  
Washington













# INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES

---

*Senate* HEARINGS *1-2*

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

UNITED STATES SENATE

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. RES. 202**

ON

THE RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE TO  
INVESTIGATE THE STRIKE IN  
STEEL INDUSTRIES



WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
1919



Doc 1685.90



William L. G. Co.,  
Washington  
(D.C.)

## INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate, pursuant to resolution, met at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 235, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon, presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Page, McLean, Sterling, Phipps, Smith of Georgia; Jones of New Mexico; Wolcott, McKellar, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

Also present: John Fitzpatrick, president of Chicago Federation of Labor, and organizer for the American Federation of Labor; W. B. Rubin, counsel for the steel committee of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Let me make this statement, please, for the record. After the adoption of the resolution by the Senate to investigate the steel strike on Tuesday of this week the chairman of the committee immediately wired to Judge Gary, president of the United States Steel Corporation, and Mr. Fitzpatrick, requesting him to appear before the committee this morning, Thursday, September 25. Subsequently the chairman received a dispatch from Mr. Fitzpatrick that he would be here, and a telephone communication from Judge Gary that it was practically impossible for him to come, or come during the week. Arrangements were made then with him over the telephone by the chairman to be here Wednesday morning of next week at 10 o'clock. At that time we will hear Mr. Gary. This meeting this morning is to hear Mr. Fitzpatrick, and if there be others, I suppose we can hear them.

Mr. RUBIN. May I ask what assurances have we that Mr. Gary will heed the request of this committee? Our experience has been that he has failed to heed the request of the President, that he has failed to meet anybody in authority to discuss this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know what assurance you may have. The only assurance I have is Judge Gary's word over the telephone that he will be here Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock, and up to that time we will not question his being here. There is no reason to question it. We will hear Mr. Fitzpatrick now.

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I think before—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Do you want to be heard before Mr. Fitzpatrick?

Mr. RUBIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give the reporter your name, please?

Mr. RUBIN. W. B. Rubin.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business, Mr. Rubin?

Mr. RUBIN. Lawyer.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a statement you want to make?

Mr. RUBIN. No. I thought I would make part of the record a telegram received by Mr. Gompers from Mr. Tumulty on behalf of the President of the United States, asking him to use his influence to defer the calling of the strike; Mr. Gompers forwarding this telegram to Mr. Fitzpatrick; reply by Mr. Fitzpatrick to President Gompers; and the reply by the committee to the President of the United States why this strike should not be delayed from September 22 to October 6.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know how the committee feels about it, but certainly I would like to have those read.

Senator McLEAN. Yes; I think they had better be read.

The CHAIRMAN. So you will read them, Mr. Rubin.

Mr. RUBIN (reading):

HON. SAMUEL GOMPERS,

*President American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.*

In view of the difficulty of arranging any present satisfactory mediation with regard to the steel situation, the President desires to urge upon the steel men through you the wisdom and desirability of postponing action of any kind until after the forthcoming industrial conference at Washington.

J. P. TUMULTY.

This was sent on September 10 from Dickinson, N. Dak. On September 11 Mr. Gompers addressed a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers:

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: This morning I received a telegram as follows:

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *September 10, 1919.*

HON. SAMUEL GOMPERS,

*President American Federation of Labor,  
Washington, D. C.*

In view of the difficulty of arranging any present satisfactory mediation with regard to the steel situation, the President desires to urge upon the steel men, through you, the wisdom and desirability of postponing action of any kind until after the forthcoming industrial conference at Washington.

J. P. TUMULTY.

You are aware of the reason which prevented my participating further, the past few days, in the conferences with the representatives of the various national and international unions involved in this question.

In transmitting the above to you (which I am doing by long-distance telephone from New York City) I want to express the hope that something can be done without injury to the workers and their cause to endeavor to conform to the wish expressed by the President; that even though the corporation may endeavor to provoke the men to action that they may hold themselves in leash and under self-control, consciously demonstrating their stamina and willingness to abide by the justice of their cause, and that their rights will be finally protected.

Fraternally yours,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,

*President American Federation of Labor.*

On September 12, 1919, from Pittsburgh, Pa., Mr. Fitzpatrick addressed this letter to Mr. Gompers:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I received your letter, containing copy of President Wilson's telegram, and note carefully the suggestions you make thereto. On



my way back to Chicago. I stopped off at Pittsburgh in order to confer with President M. F. Tighe and Secretary W. Z. Foster. We agreed to reply to your letter as follows:

You may not be aware that seven of our organizers and members have been brutally murdered in cold blood during the past few days and the campaign of terrorism on the part of the steel companies is beyond description. After a two days' conference of the responsible heads and representatives of the 24 international unions, it was decided by unanimous vote that the only way to safeguard their interests in such a situation was to set the strike for September 22. Every man connected with this movement is deeply conscious of the great responsibility devolving upon him, and it was only after every avenue of approach had been closed that the above action was taken.

Brothers Tighe, Foster, and myself considered your suggestions and finally concluded that any vague, indefinite postponement would mean absolute demoralization and utter ruin for our movement. It would be a thousand times better for the entire labor movement that we lose the strike and suffer complete defeat, than to attempt postponement now, except under a definite arrangement which would absolutely and positively guarantee the steel workers substantial concessions and protection. If these things cannot be guaranteed, then, in our opinion, our only hope is the strike.

The national committee will meet in Pittsburgh, Wednesday, September 17, at 11 a. m., for the purpose of planning the details and making final arrangements for the strike.

Yours, sincerely,

JOHN FITZPATRICK.

---

PITTSBURGH, PA., September 18, 1919.

HON. WOODROW WILSON,  
President of the United States,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Answering your request through Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, that the date of the strike in the steel industry of this country be postponed from September 22 next, the date heretofore fixed, until after a conference called by you to meet in Washington on October 6 next, we respectfully make the following report:

For years there has been great unrest among the steel workers of our country because of the unusual, unAmerican, and despotic industrial conditions. Finding no redress in individual efforts, the men naturally sought, by the example of other workers through their organizations, to associate themselves for collective defense. Oppression growing beyond endurance, the call for assistance to redress grievances came from every quarter of the industry to the St. Paul Convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in June, 1918. A committee consisting of representatives of the crafts engaged in this industry were ordered to and did make investigation. They found the field overripe for organization. The enrollment of membership grew by leaps and bounds. Relief from their oppression was imminent and, yet, out of patriotic consideration to our cause, they endured the continued suffering without cessation of their labors to the end that despotism abroad might not gain thereby aid and comfort.

Immediately after armistice was declared, the men insisted upon having their wrongs righted. They were persuaded, however, to wait until the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in June, 1919. Following a report made to that convention, Mr. Gompers sought a conference with Mr. Gary, chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation, on that subject in the hope of avoiding a grave industrial conflict. Mr. Gompers, whose constructive patriotism is beyond any question, was denied even the courtesy of a reply. Then, the men insisted upon action, and following authorization for taking a vote upon a strike, beginning with July 20 and ending August 20 of this year, 98 per cent of the men voted for a strike.

Following the vote taken, a committee representing the crafts involved went to Mr. Gary for the purpose of obtaining a conference, in the hope of avoiding the strike. Mr. Gary refused to see the committee or deal with any one of them. The committee, still desirous of avoiding the conflict, laid the entire matter before the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Gompers and the executive council indorsed the actions of the men. Nevertheless, in the hope of averting conflict, an appeal was made to your honor.

Mr. Gary, obstinate in his denial to grant relief, caused such a great unrest as to necessitate calling a meeting of the presidents of the 24 crafts involved. After a thorough, calm, and deliberate review and study of the entire situation, taking into consideration all the consequences that would naturally flow therefrom, these 24 presidents, representing over 2,000,000 organized men, indorsed the strike and set September 22 as the date thereof. The date was deferred to September 22 against the best interests of the strike solely in the hope that Mr. Gary and his associates might in the meanwhile reconsider their position, so as to avoid the otherwise inevitable conflict.

In a meeting called on September 17, at Pittsburgh, of the representatives of the aforesaid crafts for the purpose of devising ways and means of conducting the strike, your communication, through Mr. Gompers, requesting that the date of the strike be postponed was received. Two days of consideration were given to the same. Everyone present desired, if it were possible to comply with your request. Your request for postponement would have been gladly granted, were it not for the following facts:

1. Mr. Gary has asserted that his men need no trained representation in their behalf in presenting their grievances, notwithstanding that they can neither economically, by lack of means, nor intelligently, by lack of schooling, cope with him or his representatives.

2. That, ever since the men started to organize, a systematic persecution was instituted, beginning with discharge and ending with murder, recalling to us vividly the days of Homestead and the reign of despotism in Russia.

3. Through the efforts of the representatives of the steel industry, officials in various localities have denied the men free assembly and free speech. Instances are too numerous where meetings have been suppressed, men arrested, tried on various unfounded charges, excessive bail required, and cruel punishment imposed, all without warrant in law and justice.

4. As one of many examples—in the city of McKeesport a meeting held by the men within their constitutional rights was broken up and men arrested and thrown into jail, charged with riot and held to the excessive bail of \$3,000 each, while one of the hirelings of the steel industry, arrested for the murder of a woman speaker at Brackenridge, Pa., is being held under bail of but \$2,500. Another patent example is, Hammond, Ind., where four defenseless union men were charged upon and killed by hired detectives of the steel industry, and witnesses in behalf of their survivors have been so intimidated and maltreated that the truth of the killing was suppressed.

5. Guns and cannon have been planted in mills, highly charged electric wires have been strung around their premises.

6. Armed men in large numbers are going about intimidating, not only the workers, but everybody in many communities who show the slightest indication of sympathy with the men.

7. Men have been discharged in increasingly large numbers day by day. Threats and intimidations are resorted to for the purpose of putting the men in fear and preventing them from the exercise of their own free will, coerced into signing statements that they are not members, nor will become members, of any labor organization, and threatened with eviction, blacklist, denial of credit, and starvation.

8. That a forced decline of the market would be imposed so as to wipe out their holdings in stock, which they were induced to purchase in years past. Threats to move the mills and close them up indefinitely.

9. That an organized propaganda for vilification of the American Federation of Labor, spreading rumors that the strike will be delayed, and that such delay is only a sell-out.

10. Showing no opposition to the men joining dual organizations. As a result of this propaganda, the I. W. W. is making rapid headway in some of the districts.

11. That the real reason for opposition to organized labor representation on behalf of the men who have grievances is that the steel industry is preparing to cut wages and to lower the standards to prewar times, and to return to a condition that encouraged the pudrone system, so prevalent in that particular industry.

Mr. President, delay is no longer possible. We have tried to find a way, but can not. We regret that for the first time your call upon organized labor can not meet with favorable response. Believe us, the fault is not ours. If delay

were no more than delay, even at the cost of loss of membership in our organizations, we would urge the same to the fullest of our ability, notwithstanding the men are firmly set for an immediate strike. But delay here means the surrender of all hope. This strike is not at the call of its leaders, but that of the men involved. Win or lose, the strike is inevitable, and will continue until industrial despotism will recede from the untenable position now occupied by Mr. Gary. We have faith in your desire to bring about a conference and hope you will succeed therein. We fully understand the hardships that meanwhile will follow, and the reign of terror that unfair employers will institute. The burden falls upon the men, but the great responsibility therefor rests upon the other side.

Sincerely and patriotically yours.

JOHN FITZPATRICK, *Chairman.*  
WM. Z. FOSTER, *Secretary.*  
DAVID J. DAVIS.  
WM. HANNON.  
J. E. MCCADDEN.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fitzpatrick, are you ready to proceed now? Do you desire to stand up or sit down?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I had rather stand. I am used to talking standing.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when I received your telegram—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Will you please give us your name and address and your occupation, and your relationship to the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. John Fitzpatrick, 3421 Pine Hill Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; president of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you some other position in the national organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, I represent the American Federation of Labor in Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. In Chicago?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what is your relationship to this strike? That is what we want to get.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Chairman of the national committee for organizing iron and steel workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, do you desire to go ahead and discuss this matter in your own way, or do you desire the committee to ask you questions about it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that I might give you an outline of the situation as we see it, and then if there are any questions that you desire to ask, I will be glad to try and answer them.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Proceed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When I received your telegram to appear here this morning, of course we were glad to cheerfully respond and present any information or any data that we have on the situation that might be required by the committee, or by the United States Senate or by the United States Government. We want them to know all of the facts in connection with this case.

The steel situation has been one of considerable moment to the trades union movement for several years. About 18 or 20 years ago the United States Steel Corporation appropriated an amount of money—which was given as different amounts, whether it might be



two million or twenty million—for the purpose of destroying the influence of labor organizations in the steel industry. The campaign to push organized labor out of the mills was begun and continued relentlessly until practically every vestige of organized labor in the steel mills was removed.

The labor organizations, realizing what tremendous influence the steel industry has on all other industries, made up its mind that it would have to organize the steel industry, no matter at what cost, because in all other industries labor has made considerable progress, has established the eight-hour day, has established decent standards of living and labor, but in the steel mills hours are long and wages are small, below the pauper line; and, with that kind of a condition used as an argument against the effort of labor elsewhere, labor understood the necessity of organizing the steel mills.

So, at the St. Paul convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in June, 1918, a resolution was presented, calling upon the American Federation of Labor to bring the organizations interested in the steel industry together, so that they might map out a plan of action within the scope and tactics of the American Federation of Labor, for the purpose of organizing the steel mills. The resolution was adopted by unanimous vote. The president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Gompers, was instructed, under the terms of the resolution, to call into meeting the organizations who had an interest in the steel mills.

The meeting was called to meet in the city of Chicago, about August 1 or 2, 1918. Twenty-four international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor responded to the call, and campaign committees to organize the iron and steel industries were organized. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, was elected the chairman, and William Z. Foster, general organizer of the Brotherhood of Carmen of America, was selected as the secretary.

We undertook to assemble resources for the committee in the way of men and money; and, finding our resources somewhat limited, we had to confine our activities to what we called the Calumet district. That would include Joliet, Gary, Ind., Indiana Harbor, South Chicago, and a few lesser points.

In a short space, we felt the effect of our efforts. The men in the steel mills were looking for relief. They had no hope; but when they were asked by their fellow workers to meet and discuss these questions, and find some way of dealing with the situation, they responded in large numbers, and it was only a short time until we had a very successful organization in the points mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fitzpatrick, up to that time had there been no unionism in the steel mills?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you started in practically in a campaign at that time you mentioned in Chicago?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator PAGE. That was in August, 1918?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. About that time the Steel Corporation was resorting to every effort that they possibly could to thwart any action on the part of the men or action on the part of the labor organizations to spread their influence among their employees. About that

time they announced the establishment of an eight-hour day in the industry. Of course we knew that that was an effort on the part of the company to prevent organization.

Senator WALCOTT. About what time? You say "about that time" they established the eight-hour day.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Since October.

Senator WALCOTT. October?

Senator McKELLAR. October, 1918?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. After we had a successful organization in the Calumet district, then the Steel Corporation realized that the men had grievances, and that they were only looking for some method of relief and accepted this as a method and responded to it.

Senator McKELLAR. October, 1918, is it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator JONES. Mr. Fitzpatrick, let me ask you, had the employees of the Steel Corporation made application to the American Federation of Labor for their organization, or was the movement initiated by the organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The American Federation of Labor instituted the movement.

Senator JONES. There was no application from the employees of the Steel Corporation to the American Federation, inviting the American Federation of Labor to organize them?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Only the expressed wish, as the men would meet in the various communities and localities and express their desire for organization, and then where our organizations were organized and getting decent consideration at the hands of their employers, the attitude of the Steel Corporation, and their conditions of employment and hours in the steel industry was used to destroy and disrupt the good conditions that existed elsewhere in the industry.

Senator JONES. Well, that is what I was really wanting to make clear, the reason why you felt it incumbent upon the American Federation of Labor to organize the employees of the Steel Corporation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was a bad spot in the industrial situation, and it would have a tendency to drag others backward and downward, and the organized men and women of the country do not want to go backward and downward; they want to go upward and onward; and the steel situation had that effect on the labor movement, of dragging them backward and downward, just as one rotten apple will contaminate the entire barrel.

That is what the steel situation was doing to the entire labor situation.

Senator JONES. It is just that point that I would like to have made clear, if it can be, and, of course, it can. How did the conditions in the steel mills affect labor in other lines?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hours are long and the wages are small, and the treatment—you can not describe the treatment. Other employers meet and they discuss the situation in the steel mills, and they want to know why they can not do the same in their institutions, why they can not work 12 hours, why they can not pay a pittance for the labor that they use, and when our organizations would go in arbitration matters or meet employers, the barrier that was held up before them, the thing that they could not get over, was "Why don't you go to the steel mills? You get the steel mill conditions up

there, get the hours down, and the wages up there, and when you do that, of course we will treat with you then." And that was the one situation that made it absolutely imperative that the steel mills be organized, because it held the balance of the labor movement back.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed in the steel mills?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, we figure about 500,000 men.

Senator McLEAN. I suggest that Mr. Fitzpatrick be allowed to continue his statement.

As I understand it, you wish to make an opening statement, giving, as I understand it, before you conclude, your differences with your employers and the concessions which you demand or consider just. I think that the witness ought to be permitted to continue his opening statement, and I think that we will save time if that course is pursued.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am very glad to answer any question, any time, that is asked by any member of the committee on any particular point. Of course, if I can give any information to the committee, I will be very glad to do it.

Senator McLEAN. We will not make much headway unless the witness is allowed to proceed.

Senator JONES. I will be glad to withhold the further development of this point that I had started to question him about.

Senator McLEAN. Oh, I thought that the gentleman from New Mexico had concluded his inquiry in regard to the point in which he was interested, and I had no desire to interfere with the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Steel Co. gave out the information that they would establish the 8-hour day in the industry, and that was the first time on the part of the Steel Co. to do anything which might thwart or prevent organization, but the steel employees did not pay any attention to the promises made. They knew that they would not materialize, and they went on organizing. Then the demands for organization came from all through the Pittsburgh district, Youngstown, Johnstown, Cleveland, Buffalo, and elsewhere. The men in these various localities, meeting with other trades-unionists, coming and going from their work, and all that, sent out the demand that the representative of the American Federation of Labor should come there and organize them in their various occupations.

So we went into the Pittsburgh district, which is the heart of the steel industry, and proceeded exactly in the same way as we did in the Calumet district, feeling we had the legal and citizenship right to meet and discuss these questions, and if the men desired to form organizations under the banner of the American Federation of Labor, that it was their legal right, and that it would be accorded to them.

The first opposition that we met with was in the city of McKeesport. We met with all kinds of resistance. We were told that we could not have any public meetings of any description in the halls or in a vacant lot or anywhere in the vicinity of McKeesport. We called a meeting of the national committee in the city of Pittsburgh and discussed that situation, and the city council met in session. We went over to the city council and we presented the matter to the mayor and the members of the council and informed them as to the status of this proposition, that it was an American Federation of Labor effort; that these international organizations were the organ-

izations that had organizations throughout the width and breadth of this country, and that their activities were not questioned in any way, and they wanted to come into the city of McKeesport for the purpose of meeting and talking with the men of their various trades and callings, for the purpose of forming organizations and have any affiliations with the international unions that these might desire, and the men of McKeesport said that we could not meet, absolutely we could not meet in the city of McKeesport.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** That was when, may I ask?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** That was along toward the latter part of October.

**Mr. RUBIN.** Of 1918?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Of 1918, and it was in October, I think. I have not got the date here.

Then we urged the city council to take action, and then we were informed by the city council that the Mayor had absolute authority, that under the formation of the law there, the burgess, as he is called, has absolute authority, and he can deny free speech or free assemblage, or the getting together of two or three persons to talk over anything that they might want. He was asked by a councilman to permit a motion that the organization of the American Federation be permitted to meet in McKeesport, and he said that he would not do it; that he would not permit any such meeting. We felt that that was a very serious situation, that American citizens could be denied the right of free assemblage, that men could not get together and discuss with their fellows these vital questions which concerned them; and we sent a committee to Washington to take the matter up with the officers of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Gompers was here and, after hearing the story, getting the information, he directed a letter to the Mayor of McKeesport, asking him if that was his attitude, and urging reasons why the attitude should be changed, if that was the attitude, and also addressed a letter to the governor of Pennsylvania, asking that redress should be made to meet a situation of that kind, should be considered and granted.

My recollection is now that President Gomper's letters were not answered. At a later meeting the matter was taken up again by Secretary Morrison, and the same letters redirected, so that if the previous letters had gone astray that the other letters might reach their point.

Well, we got no relief, absolutely, and the situation in McKeesport was that we could not hold meetings unless we did it in contradiction of the ordinances of the city. Well, we did not want to do that. We went in there to try to meet in halls, rent halls, and when we would rent a hall, if the authorities would learn that we had succeeded in renting a hall, then they would immediately issue orders that the rent be returned and we be notified that we could not hold these meetings.

Attempts to hold meetings on the street met with arrests; our members were arrested, and finally the opposition to our efforts in McKeesport were lessened somewhat, but not before we had meetings. We called a meeting in the city of Pittsburgh of the labor organizations in the State of Pennsylvania, including the State Federation of Labor, and we asked the officers of the various inter-

national unions to come into the city of Pittsburgh to discuss and look into the situation as it confronted us in McKeesport and then we could advise as to what was the best thing to do.

Some 400 representatives of organized labor met in Pittsburgh, and that whole situation was discussed and gone over, and we were trying in every way to remove these obstacles to the right of assemblage and free speech, and when we had that meeting the opposition was not so tense—it was not removed—it was there, but it did not operate against us. We were able then to have meetings on the outskirts and on some lots that we bought in McKeesport. We were permitted to have our meetings there. That was the beginning of the opposition.

Now, in all these other points throughout Pennsylvania we met with the same kind of opposition. In Duquesne we could not have any meetings at all, and in Homestead, where we undertook to rent halls, we met with the same result, the hall rent was returned, the hall owners notified that they could not rent us halls, and we were told that permits for meetings would not be issued to us. In every city we tried to secure permits, to comply with any ordinance or regulations that they might have. But still the denial was there. We went on with our work as best we could by holding meetings in the outskirts, and the men came there and signed up with the organization, who wanted to become members of the organization.

The long winter months then were facing us, and the "flu" epidemic, and, of course, there was a kind of a cessation in activities for some time. In the spring, after the winter months had passed, we were able then to meet out in the open again, and we started again to call our meetings and congregate here, there, and elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the spring of this year?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; 1919. By May, 1919, we had something like 80,000 men in the various steel mills members of the organization in the Pittsburgh district and in the Calumet district. These men, of course, were clamoring for relief; they began to feel their power; there were a large number of men, and they wanted to take some action. We prevailed upon them to be patient, to wait until other points were organized, so that when we had a fair percentage of the employees of the steel mills we might well approach the corporation and ask for consideration.

About May, 1919, the convention of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers met in Louisville, Ky. That is the organization whose membership is 100 per cent involved in the steel industry. All of their members are working in the steel mills. The other organizations are not to that extent involved; for instance, the machinists, the molders, and the electricians and other organizations are only in the steel industry to a very small per cent of their membership, but the iron, steel, and tin workers are 100 per cent in the steel industry.

So they held the convention in Louisville, Ky., and they addressed a letter to Judge Gary, asking that Judge Gary meet with the representatives of the organization for the purpose of discussing matters of importance between them. They received an answer that the corporation was going to continue its old policy, and would not meet with the representatives of labor, but they would go on doing business in the way that they did in the past.

The time of the convention of the American Federation of Labor rolled around; that is, the convention of the American Federation of Labor in 1919, and I was asked to make a report of the progress of this campaign to that convention. I was able to report that over 100,000 men in the steel mills had joined the national unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I also presented to the convention this denial of free speech and free assemblage, and asked the American Federation of Labor to use any influence or power that it might have, so that the citizenship of the workers in western Pennsylvania might be restored to them.

The American Federation of Labor adopted a resolution which had that for its purpose, and a committee met with President Gompers for the purpose of trying to enter into negotiations with the Steel Corporation.

President Gompers addressed a letter to President Gary, couched in language with which Mr. Gompers is capable of, and asking that they meet between themselves or with representatives of both sides, for the purpose of discussing this very important situation and seeing if some common ground could not be found whereby they might have a better understanding.

The letter was ignored absolutely. There was no reply made to it. In the meantime, all of the strength and power of the United States Steel Corporation was directed toward our organization; our men were harassed, and jailed; our organizers were prevented from going into these towns and talking to the people; and we had the worst kind of opposition. It was increasing more intensely as we went along. We got to July. On July 24, international unions, cooperating in that situation, called a meeting and discussed the entire situation. They saw that they could not continue as they were going; that we were exhausting all of our efforts to get a conference and doing nothing else but that; and the steel trust was at liberty to employ any method it wanted to in order to destroy our organization, and that if the time was spent in conferences, that we would not have any organization to confer about; so that the 24 international organizations, after thoroughly discussing the situation and finding out that was the situation, then they asked their membership to take a strike vote, authorizing the committee that if these conferences which were being sought were not granted that then the men could take such action as they saw fit.

The organizations responded unanimously. Thirty days was given to the membership to cast and report their vote and the following meeting was set for August 20, the day on which the reports were to be made. When we met for the purpose of compiling the vote, 98 per cent of the men that we were able to reach and get an expression of opinion from, had voted to authorize their representatives to call a strike in the event of failure to get consideration.

Senator WOLCOTT. What was the total number of those you were able to reach and get an expression of opinion from?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We were only able to get a percentage of them. Our international organizations took a vote in their membership. We have no right of interference with the affairs of these international unions; they transact their own business and take their own vote and report the result to us. The result showed that 98 per cent of the men voting had declared for a strike.

Senator WOLCOTT. Have you any figures showing how many voted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not directly. The international organizations, as I say, have the figures.

Senator WOLCOTT. Did you not have them compiled?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We did not have them compiled. The international organizations compiled them and then reported the result to the committee in charge.

Senator WOLCOTT. Didn't you have before you figures that would disclose to you, from the information which you had, how many voted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; each international union, as I said, transacts its own business.

Senator WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When the membership votes on a certain proposition, they instruct the international office how to proceed. Then the international office notified us that as far as their membership in the steel industry was concerned that 98, 99, 75, or 60, or whatever the percentage was, had voted to strike.

Senator WOLCOTT. How did you reach the figure of 98 per cent; did you average the various percentages reported to you by the various international unions?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; when the 24 organizations reported we averaged it, and it was 98 per cent.

Senator SMITH. Ninety-eight per cent of those who voted or of the entire membership?

Senator MCKELLAR. He said of those who voted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of those who voted; yes.

Senator SMITH. Have you any report as to the proportion that voted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir. As I said before, an organization might have 10 per cent of its membership working in a mill, and only that 10 per cent would vote. The balance of the membership that would be working in shipyards, or on railroads, or in other industries, would not vote on that particular question; only the men involved in the situation.

Senator SMITH. You did not have a report of what proportion of those in the mills actually voted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of our members working in the mills, 98 per cent voted to go on strike.

Senator WOLCOTT. I understood you to say that 98 per cent of those who voted voted in favor of strike. What is there to negative the idea that that only referred to the 10 per cent of the membership voting; that is, 98 per cent in favor of strike was 98 per cent of the 10 per cent of the membership voting; what is there to negative that idea?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Suppose an organization had 10,000 men working in a mill and 80,000 working elsewhere. The 80,000 did not vote to strike; the 10,000 voted on it, and of the 10,000 voting, 98 per cent voted to strike.

Senator WOLCOTT. Then your statement of a while ago seems to have been an unfortunate one, and if I am correct in my impression, it is true that the total membership voted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. And 98 per cent of that voted to strike and 2 per cent voted against strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of the total membership in the mills voting.

Senator SMITH. Have you any report that discloses the fact that the entire membership in the mill actually voted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator SMITH. All the men voted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Chairman, was not there an understanding that the witness should be allowed to conclude his statement before being interrupted?

The CHAIRMAN. I think so; but we might as well settle that question right now.

Senator McLEAN. I offer the suggestion. The witness has been giving a history of the organization of these things and affiliation with the main federation, which was something that happened a year or more ago, but now he is getting down, perhaps, to matters of vital interest, which involves the present situation, and so far as I am concerned I have no objection to questions by the committee.

Senator WOLCOTT. The witness says that he has no consecutive statement and has no objections to questions as he goes along.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fitzpatrick, have you finished the history of this matter down to practically the present time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Down to August.

Senator McKELLAR. Perhaps it would be well to let him go on as he has been going, and he can bring the proposition down to date.

Senator WOLCOTT. I would like to ask one question, which the witness may have answered, and if he did I was woolgathering at the time. What was the total number of members in the steel mills in your organization at the time this vote was taken?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At the time the vote was taken, I should say about 100,000.

Senator WOLCOTT. And the total number of men in the industry available for entrance into the organization, if they saw fit, was how many?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There was probably about 500,000. We had one-fifth. We felt that we had the right, at least, to ask for consideration for the rights of that one-fifth.

Senator WOLCOTT. Boiling it down to figures, Mr. Fitzpatrick, the situation was this: that 98,000 men, in round numbers, voted for the strike, which involved the employment of 500,000 men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it would be somewhat different from that, because when men in the mills saw that there was a situation which might bring hope into their lives and into their homes, 50,000 men joined the organization between July and the date that we compiled the vote. Fifty thousand, so that we have 150,000 when the vote was compiled.

Senator McKELLAR. Have any joined since; and if so, how many, if you know?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our report yesterday was 340,000.

Senator McKELLAR. Three hundred and forty thousand have joined the federation since that time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.



The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have the committee settle this question of interrupting the witness. Senator Phipps has been waiting to ask questions. We had an agreement that the witness should finish his statement. I do not know whether that was a wise agreement or not, and I am inclined to think now that it was not.

Senator WOLCOTT. I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, I did not know of the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. That is perfectly all right, Senator. The question now is, Shall the committee go ahead and ask the witness questions as he proceeds? I think we really might get more out of it if we do it in that way. If there is no objection, Mr. Fitzpatrick will go ahead and the committee will ask questions as he proceeds.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In July, when the vote was taken, these men, feeling that there was something here in this country that was bigger than the steel trust, took hope and courage, and in the short space of 30 days the 50,000 men came into the organization. Then they have come in by great numbers since that time.

We have compiled the vote on August 20. A committee was appointed to approach the Steel Corporation, Judge Gary, and ask for a conference and see if there was not some way by which this matter might receive consideration.

President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, was chairman of the conference committee, together with a representative of the machinists, of the electrical workers, the car men, and one other important organization, and myself. We formed the conference committee. President Gompers at that time was in Europe. He was just about getting ready to return, so he could not act with the conference committee. We went to Judge Gary's office. Judge Gary was in an inner room. We sent in our cards and he sent out word that he asked to be excused from a personal interview, but that if we would state in writing the nature of our business that he would submit to the proper officials, who would make answer.

We submitted our proposition in writing, and immediately afterwards we got an answer from Judge Gary stating that he did not feel that we were the authorized representatives of the men, that he refused to meet us or deal with us, and that they would go on as they had in the past, taking the very best care of the employees and running their business according to their own notions.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you a copy of that request that you made to Judge Gary? If you have, I wish you would read it at this point. I would like to know just what that request was.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. The correspondence is as follows:

NEW YORK, August 26, 1919.

HON. ELBERT H. GARY, Chairman Finance Committee,  
United States Steel Corporation,  
71 Broadway, New York City.

DEAR SIR: During a general campaign of organization and education conducted under the auspices of the American Federation of Labor, many thousands of men employed in the iron and steel industry made application and were enrolled as members of the various organizations to which they were assigned.

This work has been carried on to a point where we feel justified in stating to you that we represent the sentiment of the vast majority of the employees in this industry, and, acting in behalf of them, we solicit of you that a hearing be given to the undersigned committee, who have been selected by the duly accredited representatives of the employees, to place before you matters that are

of vital concern to them, and concerning hours of labor, wages, working conditions and the right of collective bargaining.

The committee called at your office at 3 p. m., Tuesday, August 26, and requested a conference. We were advised by your messenger that you wished to be excused from a personal interview at this time and requested us to have our business in writing and whatever matters we wished to submit would be taken up by yourself and your colleagues and given consideration.

Therefore we are submitting in brief the principal subjects that we desired to have a conference on. The committee has an important meeting in another city on Thursday next and will leave New York at 5 o'clock on August 27, 1919. May we respectfully request that your answer be sent before that time to Mr. John Fitzgerald, Continental Hotel, Broadway and Forty-first Street, New York City.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN FITZPATRICK,  
D. J. DAVIS,  
WM. HANNON,  
EDW. J. EVANS,  
WM. Z. FOSTER,  
*Committee.*

We received the following reply:

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,  
New York, August 27, 1919.

MESSRS. JOHN FITZPATRICK, DAVID J. DAVIS, WILLIAM HANNON, WM. Z. FOSTER,  
EDW. J. EVANS, *Committee.*

GENTLEMEN: Receipt of your communication of August 26 instant is acknowledged.

We do not think you are authorized to represent the sentiment of a majority of the employes of the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries. We express no opinion concerning any other members of the iron and steel industry.

As heretofore publicly stated and repeated, our corporation and subsidiaries, although they do not combat labor unions as such, declined to discuss business with them. The corporation and subsidiaries are opposed to the "closed shop." They stand for the "open shop," which permits one to engage in any line of employment whether one does or does not belong to a labor union. This best promotes the welfare of both employees and employers. In view of the well-known attitude as above expressed, the officers of the corporation respectfully decline to discuss with you, as representatives of a labor union, any matters relating to employes. In doing so no personal discourtesy is intended.

In all decisions and acts of the corporation and subsidiaries pertaining to employes and employment their interests are of highest importance. In wage rates, living and working conditions, conservation for life and health, care and comfort in times of sickness or old age, and providing facilities for the general welfare and happiness of employes and their families, the corporation and subsidiaries have endeavored to occupy a leading and advanced position amongst employers.

It will be the object of the corporation and subsidiaries to give such consideration to employes as to show them their loyal and efficient service in the past is appreciated, and that they may expect in the future fair treatment.

Respectfully yours,

E. H. GARY, *Chairman.*

The following letter was then written:

NEW YORK CITY, August 27, 1919.

HON. ELBERT H. GARY,

*Chairman Finance Committee, United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York City.*

DEAR SIR: We have received your answer to our request for a conference on behalf of the employes of your corporation, and we understand the first paragraph of your answer to be an absolute refusal on the part of your corporation to concede to your employees the right of collective bargaining.

You question the authority of our committee to represent the majority of your employees. The only way by which we can prove our authority is to put

the strike vote into effect and we sincerely hope you will not force a strike to prove this point.

We asked for a conference for the purpose of arranging a meeting where the questions of wages, hours, conditions of employment, and collective bargaining might be discussed. Your answer is a flat refusal for such conference, which raises the question, if the accredited representatives of your employees and the international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the Federation itself are denied a conference, what chance has the employee as such to secure any consideration of the views they entertain or the complaints they may be justified in making?

We noted particularly your definition of the attitude of your corporation on the question of the open and closed shop and the positive declaration in refusing to meet representatives of union labor. These subjects are matters which might well be discussed in conference. There has not anything arisen between your corporation and the employees whom we represent in which the question of the closed shop has been even mooted.

We read with great care your statement as to the interest the corporation takes in the lives and welfare of the employees and their families, and if that were true, even in a minor degree, we would not be pressing consideration through a conference of the terrible conditions that exist. The conditions of employment, the home life, the misery in the hovels of the steel workers is beyond description. You may not be aware that the standard of life of the average steel workers is below the pauper line, which means that charitable institutions furnish to the pauper a better home, more food, clothing, light, and heat than many steel workers can bring into their lives upon the compensation received for putting forth their very best efforts in the steel industry. Surely this is a matter which will be discussed in conference.

You also made reference to the attitude of your corporation in not opposing or preventing your employees from joining labor organizations. It is a matter of common knowledge that the tactics employed by your corporation and subsidiaries have for year most effectually prevented any attempt at organization by your employees. We feel that a conference would be valuable to your corporation for the purpose of getting facts of which, judging from your letter, you seem to be uninformed.

Some few days are still at the disposal of our committee before the time limit will have expired when there will be no discretion left to the committee, but to enforce the decree of your employees whom we have the honor to represent.

We submit that reason and fairness should obtain than that the alternative shall be compulsory upon us.

Surely reasonable men can find a common ground upon which we can all stand and prosper.

If you will communicate with us further upon this entire matter, please address your communication to the National Hotel, Washington, D. C., where we shall be Thursday and Friday, August 28 and 29.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN FITZPATRICK,  
D. J. DAVIS,  
WM. HANNON,  
EDW. J. EVANS,  
WM. Z. FOSTER,

*Committee.*

The CHAIRMAN. What was the time limit that you spoke of in this letter?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The 28th and 29th.

The CHAIRMAN. Of August.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of August.

The CHAIRMAN. If there had been a conference, as suggested in that letter, would the strike have been called? If Judge Gary had consented to the conference which you speak of in this letter, would the strike have been called?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir.

Now, then, to follow that on—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Before you get away from that, Mr. Fitzpatrick, if there was a consent on Judge Gary's part to a conference now, would that end this strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think so, Senator. There is ground now upon which we can get together; but the mere fact of calling a conference would not be sufficient to induce the 350,000 men who have left their employment to return. They have left their employment because of the wrongs done them, because of the brutality that has been practiced against them; because their brothers and sisters have been murdered in cold blood. They resent that, and they will not go back into the mills until they get a more decent consideration; and they are going to ask the United States Government to give them just common, ordinary justice, and until that is accorded to them, our opinion is that they will not go back to the mills.

Senator WALSH. I suppose, Mr. Fitzpatrick, when you say that if their conference had been granted you would not have struck, you mean that you would not have struck on the grounds that you have struck on, namely, a refusal, first of all, to give you a conference.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A conference—I am always hopeful of a conference. I think when men get together and talk over situations, that they can make wonderful progress, no matter how far apart they seem to be at the beginning.

Senator WALSH. But the failure to adjust grievances might have led to a strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WALSH. So that the first fundamental reason for a strike was his failure to see you at all?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we had just gotten into a conference, and Judge Gary said "Go and jump out of the window," we would not do that, of course. But we did not stop there.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact, or is it the fact, that the real reason for the strike, Mr. Fitzpatrick, was the failure to grant conference?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the real reason?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. Of course, if we had got in conference we would have attempted to have presented the demand of the men, and to create ways by which the matter might be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of this letter, had the conference that the President called been called?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It had not been called? -

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we will be interested in your stating before you get through, in your own way, why this strike should not have awaited this conference?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Maybe we have got the cart before the horse here, Senator. We have made a report to the President of the United States, giving him 11 points, and in each point about three reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. You read that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; that has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. You have nothing to offer in addition to that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was an impossibility to stop this strike going into effect after the strike date had been set.

The CHAIRMAN. Who set the strike date?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The 24 international's officers.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, they could change the strike date?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not under the circumstances in this situation, as we reported them to the President. If we undertook to postpone the strike, or wait until October 6, with what they were doing in Pennsylvania, then we would have been shot to pieces. There would not have been anybody here to make any report.

Senator SMITH. What was it that they were doing that would have shot you to pieces? What do you mean by that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I mean that they deliberately murdered them; like Fannie Snellings was killed in Brackenridge.

Senator SMITH. No; that is not what you were referring to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator SMITH. No. You said if you had delayed the strike, you would have been shot to pieces. You were not referring in that "shot to pieces" to what has taken place since the strike occurred. You said if you had delayed the strike you would have been shot to pieces; your organization would have been shot to pieces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And with the shooting of our organization to pieces, our members would have been shot in cold blood, as they were.

Senator SMITH. What I asked you was, what was being done to shoot your organization to pieces. To what did you refer in that statement?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a different point, Senator.

Senator SMITH. That was the point you mentioned as being shot to pieces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Both shootings are going on.

Senator SMITH. The shooting was not going on before the strike of your men, was it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, my heavens, that was the worst situation.

Senator WALSH. Explain that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, the instance of Fannie Snellings, in Brackenridge, just to intimidate and terrorize. That created a system of terrorism.

Senator WALSH. When did this begin, that system?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It began along about June, and our members, through the foremen, through the superintendents, through the straw bosses, all kinds of intimidation. The business men in these communities were intimidated, and made to deny workers, threatened them, all of the tactics that they possibly could apply to terrorize the workers who wanted to join these organizations were applied and the men were given the choice of "You tear up your union card, or you quit your job, either one or the other; you have got your choice." All of these tactics were resorted to; and we would not have an organization. Here was a woman, an organizer, who had been speaking at some of our meetings, and there is the penalty she paid [indicating photograph]. There was the condition she was in after they got through with her. There is a woman.

The CHAIRMAN. Was she killed?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Senator, I would ask you to look at that photograph.

**Senator SMITH.** When was that?

**Senator WALSH.** You assume that we know a good deal more about those details than we do.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** This was before the strike. This was one of the women who was used as a speaker at our meetings, organizing the iron and steel workers; and up there at the Detrona plant, up around Brackenridge, there was a miners' strike on there; and one of the miners' pickets was shot. This woman was in the vicinity, and out of a back yard ran three or four children. They heard the shooting. They wanted to see what it was, and when they got out in the alley, they saw this old man, 65 years of age, who was shot down in cold blood, laying in the alley there, and they ran over to see the old man, or to help him; and Miss Snellings came around the corner there, and she saw the gunmen, with their guns, and she was afraid that they might shoot the children, and she took her skirts up and tried to huddle the children back into the fence again, and to the corner; put her skirts around them to protect them, and while she was down there trying to protect the children, the order was given "Kill this one, too," and immediately the gunmen fired into her body, and killed her, and then they dragged her in behind the fence there, and there was the condition of her head when we got there [indicating photograph].

**The CHAIRMAN.** Who were the gunmen and who gave the orders and is that connected up in any way with the steel people?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** It is the entire situation.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Who were those gunmen you speak of?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Employed by the companies to intimidate and terrorize the people.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Was this shooting that you speak of done by employees of the steel company?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** By the deputy sheriffs and by the gunmen with them, acting altogether.

**Senator WALSH.** What you mean to say, then, is that deputy sheriffs and officials, are directly or indirectly influenced by the Steel Corporation, and therefore act for them rather than for the general public. Is that your contention?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** That is the system of terrorism that has been applied.

**Senator WALSH.** But this man that shot had the title in the community, at least, of being a public officer, a deputy sheriff, or assistant deputy sheriff, or a constable? You understand what I mean?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** The information that we have was that the killing in this instance was done by what is known as mill guards.

**Senator WALSH.** Mill guards?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes.

**Senator WALSH.** Who are they and what are they? Are they on the payroll of the Steel Corporation?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes.

**Senator WALSH.** Or are they an apparent public official but really a corporation employee?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, they are sworn in as deputy sheriffs.

Mr. RUBIN. Employed by the mill?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But we do not know where their pay comes from. They are given the authority of the community.

Senator WALSH. I think this committee would be very much impressed and would be glad to hear any suggestions from you or anybody else from the scene of the activity depicting in detail the extent of terrorism or intimidation and of restraint upon personal liberty upon the part of these people.

Senator STERLING. Let the witness state now, if he knows, what provocation there was, what were the conditions leading up to this.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What we were getting at was what happened before, and what attempts we made to prevent this kind of a conflict, after we had received these rebuffs from the head of the Steel Corporation. We did not stop there. We came to the city of Washington, and the executive council of the American Federation of Labor was in session. We made a report of the entire situation to them, so that they would be in possession of a full knowledge of the situation.

Senator PHIPPS. Pardon me a minute. I think you have left, perhaps, an impression that you can clarify. I understood you to say that at the time of this double shooting at Brackenridge there was a coal strike on. Is that correct?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There was a coal strike over in Brackenridge, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Was there any disturbance on at any of the steel works located in the same neighborhood?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. There was no steel strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it your understanding that this tragedy grew out of the coal strike or out of the efforts of your organization to organize steel workers in the same locality?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our judgment is that this woman paid the penalty with her life for trying to organize the steel workers. She was to be made an example of, to put the fear of God in the hearts of these foreigners and others who are living in these localities, that they would not even stop to treat a woman in that way.

Senator PHIPPS. You have stated, however, that that just followed the shooting of a picket, who was evidently on duty on account of the coal strike situation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, what have you to connect up the two steps, other than the coal strike, the mere fact that this woman was known as an organizer of the steel workers?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that your assumption?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. That is what I wanted to clear up.

Senator SMITH. I would like to ask you if you know whether any prosecutions were conducted against these men that you call the gunmen for these deaths.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our experience in the situation is that you can not get prosecutions.

Senator SMITH. That is not what I asked you. I asked you whether you knew, as a fact, were there prosecutions, or were there not, for these deaths? Do you know?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no prosecution so far that I know of. We have shown here that the man who murdered this woman was held in \$2,500 bond. We have also shown that a man who tried to meet with his fellow workers in this same county was arrested and jailed and held in \$3,000 bonds. The only crime he committed was trying to speak to his fellow workers, and he is held in \$3,000 bonds. The murderer of this woman was only held in \$2,500.

Senator PHIPPS. Were those actions taken in the same court and bonds fixed by the same judge in both cases?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Rubin, being the attorney, handled the situation, and he says yes.

Mr. RUBIN. He was held by the same magistrate.

Senator PHIPPS. The same magistrate?

Mr. RUBIN. Yes, sir; who was also the mayor of the town.

Senator STERLING. Was the picket who was killed armed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator STERLING. Was there any violence preceding this tragedy? Had there been any violence of any kind on either side?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator SMITH. The old man you refer to was a picket?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, 60 years of age.

Senator PHIPPS. The trial has not yet been held, so that the defendants have not had any opportunity—

Mr. FITZPATRICK (interposing). He was not old, Senator, he was 60 years of age.

Senator SMITH. He was not necessarily feeble?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir. Have you anything else, Senator?

Senator PHIPPS. No. I think you have answered my question. I understand the trial has not yet been held; therefore, the facts leading up to this shooting have not yet been disclosed by evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fitzpatrick, before you get away from this, in this region where the strike is now on, can you tell us how many people were killed there in the month or two just preceding the strike, and then how many have been killed since?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not any information of anybody being killed before.

The CHAIRMAN. How many have been killed since?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say, before or since.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, you have no information?

The CHAIRMAN. We read accounts in the newspapers every day or so of someone being killed.

Senator STERLING. Seven, I think it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. About seven. These were two, and then there were four others who were killed in Indiana.

Senator PHIPPS. About what date?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it was about the latter part of August. There were four men killed there. The significant thing about that is this, that the Association of Commerce of the City of Chicago, a man by the name of Harry Merritt, made the statement that "the way to treat labor was to use the Machine Gun Corps against them—



that is, 'treat them rough.'” That was the advice of the President of the Association of Commerce of Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. Were those men in Indiana connected with the steel mills in any way?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir; the Standard Steel Car Co.'s plant, it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us the circumstances under which they were killed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; I am going to try to give you that. The next day after they were advised to treat labor rough, the gun men in charge of the Standard Steel Co.'s plant shot into a crowd of men with the result that the 4 were killed and about 15 wounded.

The CHAIRMAN. That was before the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was before the strike.

Senator PHIPPS. The Standard Steel Car plant, Mr. Fitzpatrick, is that Standard Steel Car plant owned by or in any way connected with the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course we feel that all of these concerns are under the domination and control of the United States Steel Corporation, but the Standard Steel Car Co. employees had been on strike.

Senator PHIPPS. There was a strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There was a strike, and there was a lot of gun men around the plant, and they said that these foreigners were on strike and that there were Americans there who wanted to go to work. The Americans that they brought in there were 200 gun men, men who did not come there to go to work, men who would not know how to start to work in the place, but under the protection of being Americans they brought them in there as Americans who wanted to go to work, but they were strike breakers, gun men, and then they paraded them up the street and of course the workmen, seeing them parading up the street, jeered and hooted at them, and the gun men shot into the strikers. There was no commotion and no blow stuff, and four were killed.

Senator PHIPPS. As an organizer of the American Federation of Labor, do you not know that this Standard Steel Car plant, where the strike was going on, is not owned by the Steel Corporation, and that the Steel Corporation has no connection with it whatever?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, of course, if that is a fact, well and good, but with regard—

Senator PHIPPS (interrupting). You do not know of your own knowledge whether or not it is?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, this affair then at the Standard plant was not due to any effort on the part of your men to organize the employees of the United States Steel Corporation, was it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, we organized the entire steel industry, no matter where it went. We organized the Standard and all of the various small companies.

Senator SMITH. That was not the steel company plant—if it was not, it could not have been your effort to organize the steel company men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We organized the steel industry.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** Mr. Fitzpatrick, that is a new piece of information to me, and it suggests a new thought in connection with the question that I asked you awhile ago. Can you tell us how many of this 100,000 membership at the time of the strike vote were employees of the United States Steel Corporation, with which concern you are having the dispute and one of the elements of that dispute being chiefly as to whether or not you represented the majority of the employees of that company. Can you tell us how many of the 100,000 membership were employed by the United States Steel Corporation?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Well, we feel that they are all steel company employees.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** Well, you may figure that way, but the question to my mind is whether or not they were. When you are having a dispute with the steel company it is very material what portion of your membership is in fact—but you say that you represent a majority of them—what portion of their employees are represented by you, as distinguished from independent companies like the Standard? Now, I ask you the question, can you tell us how many of your membership were in the employ of the United States Steel Corporation?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Well, we do not know whether the Standard Steel Car Co. is a subsidiary or not. We do not know that. We know that they have lots of subsidiaries. We did not organize the employees of the United States Steel Corporation or any of its subsidiaries as such. We organized the steel industry.

**Senator SMITH.** Did you have, before you went to Judge Gary, a talk with the men employed by his companies, stop and find out how many were represented, how many you represented who were employed in his companies?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** We made the statement to him that we represented the vast majority of the men in the steel industry, and he did not ask to find out who we represented. He said that he did not think we did represent anybody.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Are the men who have gone out on the strike all members of the American Federation of Labor?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Sir?

**The CHAIRMAN.** Are all the men who have gone out on the strike in the steel industry all members of the American Federation of Labor?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes, sir.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Then you have a membership of nearly 300,000 members?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** We have over that now.

**The CHAIRMAN.** And, as I understand it, when you talked with Judge Gary you only had about 100,000?

**Mr. FITZGERALD.** No. When we sent the letter, when President Gompers wrote the letter to Judge Gary, we had 100,000. When we made the statement that there was an absolute denial or refusal there, then the men in the mills said: "If that is going to be the attitude of the corporations in this country, that they will not even answer a letter of the president of the American Federation of Labor, we probably had better be doing something," and a large number came into the organization from June up until July. When there was no

answer, then we asked the membership we had then, 110,000 or 115,000, whatever it was, to authorize their representatives by a strike vote to proceed to see Judge Gary and to present their grievances and ask for copies of reports. When that vote was taken, 50,000 more men came into the organization before the vote was polled. The vote was polled between July 20 and August 20, and we had 165,000 to 175,000 men then.

The CHAIRMAN. And you finally got up to about 300,000 men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then we made the other effort to get in touch with Judge Gary, and Judge Gary then absolutely refused and gave publicity to the statement that he would not treat with the representatives of the employees. We did not stop there, but we came here to Washington and presented the matter to the American Federation of Labor, and after they had listened to the entire situation they decided that they would, through President Gompers, try and enlist the cooperation and support of the President of the United States, and President Gompers was authorized to act with the committee, and the next day we called upon the President and had an audience of some 55 minutes with him, and we told him that we were selected as the representatives of the employees of the steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. May I ask, how was that selection made?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. I mean the selection of the committee, which was constituted of yourself and Mr. Foster and certain other men, and constituted a committee to present the demands to the representatives of the Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The 24 international presidents or their personal representatives; that is the way the committee is constituted, and they selected this committee.

Senator PHIPPS. That was following the taking of the strike vote, which you think covered about 150,000 employees of the Steel Corporation at that time. You did not have with you the figures as to this poll, how many voted in favor of the strike and how many were against? You have not them with you now? Can you furnish them for the record by getting the information from these 24 organizations, how many men did vote on that strike question?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I can ask that that information be submitted as soon as we can get hold of it and furnish it to the committee.

Senator PHIPPS. I think we ought to have it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I think we ought to have it. That will be done.

Senator JONES. Mr. Fitzpatrick, I think it is advisable to do that, and, also, if you can in any way, present the number of employees of the United States Steel Corporation who were members of the organization at the time your committee went to Mr. Gary.

Mr. RUBINS. That will be very difficult for us to do unless we knew exactly what companies are subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation. We know there are 500,000 employees of the steel industry, and 300,000 are members of organized labor, but unless we know which of the companies are independent, we could not get you that definite information.

Senator JONES. You have no information on which to deny the statement made by Mr. Gary then. Mr. Gary takes the position that you do not represent his employees.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes, sir; but the answer is apparent now. The men say that we do represent them, and 340,000 of them are out on the streets.

**Senator JONES.** I can see the present situation, but I was trying to get the situation as it presented itself to Mr. Gary at the time, and what he may have stated then may have been perfectly true, and it may be true now that you have a vast majority of these employees in your organization, and undoubtedly Mr. Gary will make the statement here that you do not represent any considerable number of his employees, and we are trying to develop the full facts, because you are here with us now, and we do not expect that you will remain here all of the time, and we want to get all these facts that we can.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Our communication to Judge Gary was, when he said that he did not believe that we were authorized to represent a majority, we said to him that the only way we can prove that is to call this strike and tie up this mill, and we asked that he did not put us in the position to do that.

**Senator JONES.** Do you say that that was the only way that you could have proven your strength among his employees?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** I say that he would not believe it otherwise.

**Senator JONES.** Could not you have had a roll of your membership in the mills made and have presented them to him—

**Mr. FITZPATRICK** (interrupting). He said that he did not believe we had authority to represent them, and in the meantime, Senator, this campaign of terrorism was carried on against our organization and against our men. Our position was to protect ourselves. We had to save our organization. The only way we could save our organization was to tell the men "Here is what you have got if you don't organize; if you are going to defend yourselves, leave the mills, and let them run the mills if they want to."

**Senator PHIPPS.** Under your statement, you say that you began organizing after the month of May, 1919, and in May you judged that you had some 100,000 members—

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** No, Senator, no; I said we started to organize in August, 1918.

**Senator PHIPPS.** You made the statement that in June of 1919 you had at least 100,000 men.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** One hundred thousand.

**Senator PHIPPS.** And the men came in, ten or fifteen thousand more, and that by July, the end of July, there had been an increase, and when your strike vote was taken some time in the early part of August, that 150,000 men had voted?

**Senator WOLCOTT.** One hundred thousand.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** No, there was more than that.

**Senator PHIPPS.** He corrected that and said there were 150,000. I think that I am correct. Then, what reason had you to fear that your organization would be disrupted rather than increased as it had been by the additional new members?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Just that opposition which the steel mills developed and which we showed to the President of the United States. There is no question about that.

**Senator PHIPPS.** But there was no cessation—

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** No, we were on the job, we were meeting with the situation.

Senator PHIPPS. And you also added members?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is that?

Senator PHIPPS. And you had also added new members to your organization all the time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir. We doubled our membership since they went on strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Fitzpatrick, I think it would be of service to the committee to know something of your experience in the steel business now at the present time.

Senator WOLCOTT. May I interrupt you and interject a question before you proceed with that, Senator?

Senator PHIPPS. Yes, yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. I want to get this vote business straightened out. I understood you to say, and if I am wrong please correct me, but I understand you claim to say that you polled this vote and your membership was 100,000, and it took about a month for the returns to come in, and during that interval 50,000 more joined your organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WOLCOTT. And you sent out, in round numbers, 100,000 votes—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, no, we let that 50,000 vote, too.

Senator WOLCOTT. Oh, they voted too, so that their votes were counted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir, and we also provided a way so that the nonunion men could vote. We prepared a box so that the men who did not want to join the union, we wanted them to have a right to vote, so that it would reach all of the men in the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. How did they vote?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was about 100 percent. I think that every one except—that there were only two votes voting no.

The CHAIRMAN. Only two votes against the strike?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, I could not say that number. I recollect that only two men, nonunion men, voted not to strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You have undoubtedly seen the charge made, and I wish you would explain it, I have seen it in the newspapers—that the strike was caused largely by those who were not citizens of the United States, aliens, and that the Americans wanted to work and wanted to go back to work. Did you expect to talk about that at all?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What can you say about it now?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, there are 24 international unions involved here, and those 24 international unions have agreed to strike simultaneously. They have decided to strike simultaneously, and the membership of each of these organizations is involved in this strike. Now to say that to raise that bugaboo upon them, that they are foreigners or aliens, or anything of that kind, that is only done by the newspapers that are controlled by the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. You have probably seen in the records of Congress, a speech made by Mr. Cooper, representing Ohio, making severe charges against Mr. Foster.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now this committee wants to get all of that information. Now can you give us information as to the proportion

of men in the mills who are naturalized Americans or native-born Americans and those who are aliens. Can you give us any light on that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. We never go into it in that way. We have to organize the employees of the steel mills. Now, if those men were not employed by the steel mills, we would not have them in the organization. The fact that they are in the steel mills—if they are good enough for Mr. Gary to use, why they are good enough to go into our organization. That is the position that we take in that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us any information as to the proportion of workers who do not speak the English language in the steel mills?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think there are but very few of them who can not speak the English language. The stoppage of immigration as a result of the war has made it possible, so that we think that the English language is used now in our industries. Before the war immigration was carried on in the way it was and the English language was practically wiped out of the industries, the English language was not used, but now, since the war, since the war has stopped immigration, the men in the mills have become Americanized to the extent that they all use the English language. I recollect, as an organizer of the American Federation of Labor, I had to try to convey the message to them through 14 different languages.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got to do anything of that kind now?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I think not. I have addressed these various centers and these large meetings and gatherings and I have not had to call upon an interpreter of any language to make it plain. The men in the industries are Americanized to the extent of knowing and understanding the English language. And these are the same fellows, Mr. Senator, that gave up everything that they have got to sustain this nation in its crisis. They gave of their mental and physical energy. They worked these inhuman hours. They toiled from early morning until late at night, and speeded themselves up to the limit, and they did every thing they could to sustain this nation. They did not inject their questions of remedying the conditions that they worked under. They let all of that go by default. They took it off of their backs and off of their stomachs, and they went without shoes. Their wives and their children were reduced to the lowest point. These men were the backbone of America during this war, and they gave up their own flesh and blood in the form of their brothers and their sons, and I say now that after all the mills of this country were the first line trenches of the war, and the past was harder.

Those were the fellows that stood guard. They waited patiently until the whole thing was over, and after it was over, they selected their representatives to go to the heads of the great corporation, which controlled the situation, and asked to be heard on their grievances which they had. The corporation says: "No; we will not hear you; we do not think the men you send to us are your representatives. We will not listen to you."

That is the treatment that is accorded to them.

I want to make this plain, gentlemen, in order to show you that we did not stop at any halfway measures. When we were turned

down in all ways, in all the ways I have tried to point out here, then, under the instruction of the executive council and with the instruction of President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, we went to the President of the United States and we presented our proposition to him. He said he felt that we were entitled to a conference, and that he would try to secure a conference for us; that he would do the best he could to do that.

In the meantime, mind you, we were at the 10 days in which to put the strike into effect. It was from August 20 to August 30—we had 10 days in which to put the strike into effect. It was about the 29th of August when we had opportunity of presenting the matter to the President. Of course the President would not accept the proposition if we were to be limited by the 10-days period. We assured him that we would delay the matter any reasonable length of time, so that he might be able to get a conference for us. With that assurance he went ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he try to get a conference with Judge Gary for you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no doubt about it. He informed us that he had tried to get a conference, had failed, but was still hopeful and would try again. We waited and waited into the next week.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you understand, from what the President said to you, that he had endeavored to get a conference with Judge Gary for you men and had failed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You understood it in that way?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to ask anything that might not be proper, but did he say so in so many words, or did you gather that from what he did say to you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He satisfied us that his efforts to secure a conference had proved futile.

The CHAIRMAN. That Judge Gary would not agree to a conference, even though requested to do so by the President of the United States?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you gathered from his statement to you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; we waited from the 30th of August until the 22d of September. In all, there were 32 days that we utilized in trying to get conferences and failed. That was why we set it up to September 22, so that something might develop and a conference be brought about. But it was not. In the meantime this situation of terrorism was going on. As explained here by the letter which was read, from the report to the President, that it was absolutely impossible to forestall the strike; it was their only method of defense.

What is going on in Pennsylvania to-day, let me say to you gentlemen of the committee, if it continues, the strike is not going to be confined to the steel industry.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not want it continued, do you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I beg your pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not want it, with all its bloodshed, to continue?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not want it to continue if it can be adjusted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir; but if the legal authorities, the supposed legal authorities in Pennsylvania, will not recognize the rights of men, women, and children in Pennsylvania, and it is not done quickly, nobody can tell what is going to be the outcome of this situation. I tell you now, Mr. Chairman, that in Homestead—let me give you this illustration from Homestead—they are actually riding their horses into the kitchens of the homes of these men who are on strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Who did that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In an effort to drive them back to work.

The CHAIRMAN. Who did that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The "Cossacks," as we call them.

The CHAIRMAN. And who are they?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The State constabulary. In one instance, in Homestead, a woman was in her kitchen, with a child in her arms. She was pregnant at the same time. A "Cossack" rode into her kitchen, bumped her stove with his horse and tipped over a pot of food that was on the stove, over on to the floor, and scalded the woman. That was at Homestead yesterday.

In Clairton on Sunday our men were meeting in session. They had a meeting there. One speaker had already gotten up and talked to the crowd and told them that the strike was going into effect; that they had to see that law and order should be maintained; every man should go his own way, but not congregate in crowds, and so on. When he completed his speech, a second speaker got on the platform and started to address the men in the same way. These were all officers, or international officers, who were doing this, under our instruction. Without warning, a crowd of about seven of these horsemen dashed around a corner and into that lot, through the crowd of women and children and everybody else; tramped them over, and pulled these men down from off the platform. They put those men under arrest, and then they started their horses running through the crowd, riding down men, women, and children.

The CHAIRMAN. What law were these men violating?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What law?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, when they pulled them down from the platform. What law were they violating? Is there any law that those men were violating?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely no law.

The CHAIRMAN. They were just making speeches there?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were talking among themselves.

Senator WOLCOTT. Was that a private lot?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A private lot—no, not a private lot. It is what is called the public common.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they making any disturbance?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is a public common, where all public assemblies gather.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they making any disturbance?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator WOLCOTT. Were they obstructing the highway?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; they were on the common.



Senator WOLCOTT. I wondered if there was a highway going through the common.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the duties of the State constabulary, if you know?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are a strike-breaking institution. I do not know that they have any other purpose to serve. That is what they are used for now, to break this strike, terrorize the people and drive them back to work.

Let me read an affidavit in connection with this, just to show you how the legal rights of these men are being considered.

That was the situation at Clairton. Now, at Duquesne, the police officials and the State constabulary are giving the men the choice of either going back into the mills or going to jail. These men are thrown into jail when they refuse to break the strike by going back to work under the threats of the mill town officials.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they thrown into jail without any charges being brought against them?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And without any trials?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How general is that practice?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is very general.

Just let me show you how the thing works out. This is the case of two brothers. This first affidavit is as follows:

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
County of Allegheny, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared John Yuha, who being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says as follows:

I reside at No. 1544 South Street, East Pittsburgh, Pa., and am employed by the Union Railroad magnet shop.

That on September 7, 1919, about 2.30 p. m., I was arrested near Grant Avenue, Duquesne Alley, County of Allegheny, and State of Pennsylvania, without a warrant and without being advised as to what charge was being brought against me.

That I was arrested at about 2.30 p. m. and remained in the police station until 8 o'clock a. m. September 8, 1919.

That on the hearing held on Monday, September 8, 1919, I paid a fine of \$10 and costs amounting to \$2.75.

That I obtained a transcript of the case and the hearing on the appeal of my case in court was held Tuesday, September 23, 1919, at 9.30 o'clock a. m. And on Tuesday, September 23, 1919, at 6.20 a. m., I was again arrested while I was in Duquesne, Pa., ready to take a car to go to Pittsburgh to attend to my case in court. I was arrested by three Duquesne policemen and stayed there until Wednesday, September 24, 1919, about 9.30 a. m. They fined me \$25 and costs. I asked on the 22d about bail, and they told me "no bail for you," and they kept me until next day at 9.30 a. m.

I was walking to the street car stop when I was arrested, and was doing nothing. Before they arrested me they asked me where I was going. I told them I was going to Pittsburgh to attend my case. They did not say a word but followed me a little piece, and then they grabbed me and said, "you won't go to Pittsburgh."

JOHN YUHA.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 24th day of September, A. D. 1919.  
[L. s.] MYRTLE B. HENDERSON,

Notary Public.

My commission expires January 21, 1921.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that man's business? What did he do?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** He was employed in the Union Railroad magnet shop. On Sunday afternoon he went to a meeting and was arrested for being present at the meeting.

His brother's case is similar. He has made the following affidavit:

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

*County of Allegheny, ss:*

Before me, the undersigned authority, appeared Joe Yuha, who, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says, as follows:

I am married; age, 33; and live at No. 133 Fair Alley, Duquesne, Pa. I was working at Rod Mill, Carnegie Steel Co., Duquesne, Pa.

I was arrested in Duquesne September 7, 1919, and fined on September 8, 1919, \$10 and costs.

I got a transcript to take the case into court. The case was to come up on Tuesday, September 23, 1919. On September 23, 1919, at 6.20 a. m., I was arrested while walking on Linden Avenue, Duquesne, Pa., where I was going to the street-car stop in order to get a car to attend my case in Pittsburgh. The police stopped me and asked me where I wanted to go, and I answered him I want to go to Pittsburgh. He said you are not going to Pittsburgh now; you are going to another Pittsburgh, and he called the patrol wagon and took me and my brother John to the Duquesne police station. I asked him what I am arrested for and he did not answer me. When I was at the police station I asked about bail and the chief of police told me "there is no bail from you," and I was kept in jail until the next morning, when I was fined \$25 and costs. I asked for a transcript and they told me "no transcript until Saturday."

JOE YUHA.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 24th day of September, A. D. 1919.

[L. S.]

MYRTLE P. HENDERSON,

*Notary Public.*

My commission expires January 21, 1921.

That is the kind of treatment that they were receiving.

I might say, in connection with the death of those four men in Indiana, that when the coroner's jury was assembled for the purpose of passing upon the cause of death of those four men, the witnesses for the survivors were arrested and thrown into jail, so that they could not come before the coroner's jury and testify who was guilty in that situation.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** Transcripts of those Yuha cases are not here?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** No; not the transcripts, just the affidavits of the complainants.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** The affidavits are not very illuminating. They just say that the men were arrested and fined; but what the circumstances were are not disclosed.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** They were fined.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** The transcripts were taken for purposes of appeal, I suppose?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes; they took an appeal. Then when they went to go to Pittsburgh to testify on their appeal, or to defend their case on appeal, they were arrested and again thrown into jail and fined \$25 more.

**Mr. RUBIN.** In order to explain that, when a person is arrested and brought before a magistrate in Pennsylvania, or in the Pittsburgh district, oral testimony is taken, and, if he is found guilty, he takes an appeal. By taking the court transcript or record does not mean the oral testimony. He then goes to the county court and he gets a new trial, de novo.

Senator WOLCOTT. But, of course, the transcript will show the charge brought against him?

Mr. RUBIN. Yes; it will show the charge. It happens in McKeesport that a member of the council is also mayor. He introduced a resolution forbidding free speech except by permission of the mayor and he signed the resolution as passed by the council. Then, as mayor, he sits as a magistrate and fines these men.

Senator WOLCOTT. He is a law maker and the judge, too, is he?

Mr. RUBIN. Yes; higher than the President of the United States.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In McKeesport, Mr. Chairman, I have told you about the preliminary opposition; but since this strike has been on the opposition has been unimaginable. The police are there with these mounted horsemen. They will not permit meetings of any description. We can not call a meeting of the local union of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a large plant at McKeesport?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. There are several large plants there. They have gotten so now, that two men are not allowed to talk on the street. They ride right into our meetings, trample over the men, club them and beat them down in the most brutal fashion.

Now, I want to show you that this is on the part of the authorities, and I think that thing ought to be well set up. In Clareton and Homestead, Duquesne, and McKeesport the authorities there interfere with the legal rights of the men. They won't allow them to meet; they won't allow them to do anything. They just club them and beat them and drive them into the street, and ride into their houses.

At Rankin and Braddock—and this is the particular point that I think you ought to get—at Rankin and Braddock on Sunday, when our organizers went there to instruct the strikers how to conduct themselves in this strike, the mayor and the chief of police went to the meeting with them. They stood alongside the platform. Our organizers told the group of men to observe the law; that we have always lived within the law; we humbly bow our heads in submission to the law at any time and under any circumstances; and at this time more than any other we are going to subscribe to that principle; that we were going to do that now more than ever.

Then the chief of police and the mayor said to the crowd, "Now, boys, we were going to say something to you, but we can not add anything to what your organizers have said here, and your officers, and if you will do that, there won't be a bit of trouble here."

The meeting broke up and they went away. That happened at Rankin and at Braddock, and there has not been a blow struck at either place.

Then, in South Chicago, Indiana Harbor, Gary, and Joliet, we met all through that district and addressed the meetings; we told the men what we expected of them; that, although the corporation and the newspapers were trying to make outlaws of them because they left their work, and that these indignities would be heaped upon them, that they would have to use more restraint upon themselves than in the past; that now was the time to uphold the law and see that the law was carried into effect in every way.

Well, of course there is no harassing, there is no terrorizing, there is no intimidation on the part of the officials of these towns, and there is not a blow struck.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Fitzpatrick, at the Steel Corporation Co. plant in Braddock and Rankin, did the men go out on strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Did they go out on strike at Claretton?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there a plant of the Steel Corporation also, or does that belong to the Crucible Steel Co. of America?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I could not tell you who the ownership is.

Senator JONES. Then, Mr. Fitzpatrick, this strike is not confined to the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Sir?

Senator JONES. Is this strike confined to the Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To the United States Steel Corporation?

Senator JONES. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course I presume that the Steel Corporation will be able to show that they have not got ownership in some of these places that are on strike.

Senator JONES. Was it your intention to confine the strike to the Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator JONES. So that it is a strike of all the steel industry generally?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All right, the United States Steel Corporation dominates the United States steel industry, and whatever the United States Steel Corporation does every lesser concern has got to do, or else it will be put out of business. Our organizations have information from men who utilize this steel after it has been fabricated and then they put it in the place—they have been notified that “unless you transact your business on the basis on which the United States Steel Corporation transacts its business, it will not be agreeable for either of us.” That is the language. They do not come out and say “we will put you out of business.”

Senator JONES. I was just trying to develop the actual fact, and then the reasons for it can be presented, and of course we will want to know the reasons, but it is a fact, as I understand you, that this is a general strike in the steel industry, and not confined to the Steel Corporation.

Mr. RUBIN. No, Bethlehem is not involved.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At the present time Bethlehem is not involved, but the men in Bethlehem, though, I think, are taking a strike vote now.

Senator JONES. Now, I think this is a point that should be made clear, and it ought to be very easy to make it clear. In ordering the strike, did you instruct your people to confine themselves to the properties of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator JONES. Then in what terms did you order the strike? Was it to be a general strike, or were there to be exceptions to it, and if so, what were the exceptions?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That the men in the steel industry, as we could not get any consideration, or if the Chief Executive of this Nation could not get any consideration, that then we would cease work and we feel that this is just as much an effort on the part of labor to sustain the Executive of this Nation in this instance as it was their desire and effort to sustain it in the crisis presented in the war.

Senator JONES. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Just as much. Here is an institution, the Steel Corporation, which sets itself up within the confines of the United States and raised an Army, armed men, and sends them on the street to terrorize the citizenship of these communities, and then when the President of the United States asks for a conference he can not secure that conference, and the men in the mills have made up their minds that that is a menace to this Nation, and they say that they are with the President of the United States, the Chief Executive of this Nation, in seeing that the chief officer of this Nation will be respected and that an institution in this country can not be bigger than the President.

Senator JONES. Mr. Fitzpatrick, just bear with me a moment. Do I understand, or do you want the committee to understand, that because Mr. Gary of the Steel Corporation would not grant a conference to your committee, that you ordered a strike of the whole industry, whether belonging to the Steel Corporation or not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All of these other concerns had sufficient knowledge, and if they wanted to treat with us we were within their reach at all times, and there was not any desire on their part.

Senator JONES. But I want to get at the fact, now. That all may be true which you say, but the committee, from what you have said, it seems to me is compelled to come to this bald conclusion of fact, that you did not interview the officials of other plants who own them separate from the Steel Corporation; you made your sole effort to get a conference with Mr. Gary. Failing in that, you then ordered the strike in the whole industry, whether Mr. Gary had any official connection with the other plants or not. Now that is the status of this case. If you want it to rest there, all well and good. What I am seeking to do is to draw out the whole facts.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The men in the steel industry were organized regardless of what plant or what name was over the door. They all came into the organization. We proceeded to procure a conference in the big situation, the dominating situation, the United States Steel Corporation. All of these other concerns, if they are not subsidiaries, or if they are not dominated or controlled by the United States Steel Corporation, they knew that their men were organized, that they were members of our organizations, and that they were going to go on strike, and if they had wanted to negotiate an agreement with them they could have called them into a conference.

Senator WOLCOTT. It seems to me that you are assuming a great deal there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Just a minute.

Senator WOLCOTT. All right. Go ahead. Pardon me.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When we failed to get the conference, when Judge Gary refused to meet anybody connected with the institution or the President of the United States, then the men in the mills left their places of employment. The strike was not called by any one individually. These 24 international unions advised their members employed in the various steel mills that if they wanted to go on strike on that particular date that that was all right within the laws of the international unions.

Mr. RUBIN. I think I can answer the question. I think the men went out on strike in those mills in which they had taken the vote and in none other.

**Mr. FITZGERALD.** Of course, there are mills running.

**Mr. RUBIN.** And they struck at those mills only which were dominated by the United States Steel Corporation or in some way associated. As a matter of fact, one of the corporations near Chicago came out and said it was an independent mill, didn't it? I think we gathered that, Mr. Fitzpatrick?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** No. They have got, I think, four mills running. We will say that South Chicago is here [indicating], and Gary is here, and Joliet is here. Right in the center, east of Chicago, there are four union mills, and those four union mills are running. They are not called out on strike, and any other concern in that district that wanted to go to their employees and say "Let us confer and come to an understanding here and go ahead with this situation," the committees would have been ready to go in and make an agreement at any time.

**Senator PHIPPS.** In what form were the demands of the employees presented to the independents before they went on a strike?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Only a general circular sent out, containing those points, among which was the eight-hour day, the right of collective bargaining, the abolition of company unions, the reemployment of men discharged for union activities, and physical examination by corporation as a matter of employment, and matters of that kind.

**Senator PHIPPS.** Did it include the check-off system? Is that asked for?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes.

**Senator PHIPPS.** That is one of the demands?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** That is one of the demands, but that would only apply to certain places and in certain localities. For instance, if we had a union concern here that did not employ members of the United Mine Workers of America, or members of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, the other organizations would just forego that question of the check-off; but if these two organizations were in there and they wanted to insist on that being considered, that would be made one of the propositions in a situation of that kind.

**Senator PHIPPS.** Now, you have laid a little stress on the point of the President being unable to secure a conference with the officials or the head of the Steel Corporation, and in that regard the position and the dignity of the President has not been upheld; but how about the request of the President, made to your organization, that this matter be deferred until after the conference of labor and capital which he has arranged here in this city for the 6th of October. Did you comply with the request of the President or duly give weight to the consideration that he presented to you before authorizing this strike, and if you were in position, and you claim you were, and did as a matter of fact postpone the date of initiating the strike at his request until September 22—

**Mr. FITZPATRICK (interposing).** No, the date was not set, Senator.

**Senator PHIPPS.** Well, you postponed the date, as you have said over the ten days from the latter part of August?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** We postponed the setting of the date.

**Senator PHIPPS.** Yes, you postponed the setting of the date. If that could be done, as you understand your authority granted from the workers, as you understood that authority to mean, why didn't you

comply with the President's request for a further postponement until after this labor conference here?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For the reasons stated in our answer to the President, why we could not comply. We gave the President eleven points, and in each point there are about three reasons why it was absolutely impossible on our part to comply with his request, and we made answer to him. We understand that Judge Gary did not make any answer at all.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was the difference.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Mr. Fitzpatrick, as I remarked some time ago, I think it would be enlightening to this committee to know, in addition to your connection with the American Federation of Labor, and the fact that you are at the head of this present strike, what your former occupation was, how long you have been affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or under its employ, for instance, and what your business was previous to that time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, I am a horseshoer by trade, and have been a representative of the Chicago Federation of Labor in the capacity of organizer for a number of years.

Senator PHIPPS. About how many?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Twenty.

Senator PHIPPS. Twenty years?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, and about, oh, I think, as a representative of the American Federation of Labor, as a general organizer, for about eighteen years.

Mr. RUBIN. How long have you been president of the Chicago Federation of Labor?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have been president of the Chicago Federation of Labor 15 years consecutively, and I was president for two terms prior to that, which would make about 16 years altogether.

Senator PHIPPS. Prior to that time, did you follow your trade of horseshoer?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; for a number of years.

Senator PHIPPS. Then have you ever had any actual practical experience in a steel mill?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not in a steel mill.

Senator PHIPPS. Or a foundry?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Or a steel plant of any kind?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. You have not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. What general knowledge have you of the steel business as to the terms of employment and the rates of pay received by the workmen in the various positions?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Only with coming in contact with the men and meetings and the officers of the organizations that are directly involved.

Senator PHIPPS. You have on file in your Chicago office schedules of rates of wages that are prevalent at the present time in the steel mills, supplemented by lists showing the amounts of pay received on the average by different employees in various lines?



Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that at the office of the Amalgamated Iron, Steel and Tin Workers in Pittsburgh that they have all of that information of the entire steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. But of your own personal knowledge you are not familiar with those schedules?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not personally, no. But the one organization, that is 1 of the 24, and as I tried to explain a little while ago, that is 100 per cent involved in this steel situation, that organization has all of the information with regard to the steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. At present I am trying to get at your personal familiarity with the rates of pay received by the workmen in the steel industry. Do you know what the rates of pay are in the Chicago district, where you live? Do you know what a roller receives; what he averages a month?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Or a helper, or a hooker? You do not know what those men average in the way of wages?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know what the rate of day labor paid in the mills here is?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Only that the men that I have come in contact with in South Chicago and in Gary and other places say it is about 40 cents an hour, or as low as 40 cents an hour.

Senator PHIPPS. Forty cents an hour?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that more or less than ordinary labor—I mean unskilled labor—is paid in the Chicago district?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh my, yes, I think so.

Senator PHIPPS. It is less?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean to say that a day laborer in Chicago is paid more than 40 cents an hour?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes; sure; certainly.

Senator PHIPPS. That is your information?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, sure.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you visited these steel plants frequently? Have you gained admittance and conversed with the men actually on the job, in the condition under which they labor in the mills?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, no. You can not get in the mills at all. That is, any of our organizers or trades-union representatives. We can not go near the mills at all. We have to meet these men out on the side, or go to their homes.

Senator PHIPPS. Then your testimony as to the conditions under which the men actually labor and the sum of their earning, the rates they received, is based on hearsay. You do not know of your actual knowledge?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, it is general public information. It has been published all over.

Senator PHIPPS. You have stated that these men receive a mere pittance, less than will enable them to acquire the properties, the food, the clothing, that are ordinarily given to a pauper in public institutions?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you think that is a fair statement of the situation, judging from what you have been told?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; I think so.

Senator PHIPPS. You do?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes sir. The way I arrive at that, Senator, is this, that the hours of labor in the steel mills are 12 hours a day, and the home life of the entire family is destroyed where a 12-hour day obtains. There is no home life there. You break down the life of the wife and the children in that situation, and, as has been subscribed to by the women in the Chicago district:

It is not a question of money here: we do not want the money; what we want is happiness, and we can not get happiness with the 12-hour day.

The father says "When I go to work in the morning at 5 o'clock, I go in and look at my babies and they are asleep. I can not even kiss them, because I might wake them." He goes to work. He gets home at 7 o'clock at night. He goes to the crib and the cradle again, and he looks at the kids, and there they are again asleep, and then he is so tired and fatigued after those 14 hours that he throws himself into bed, to get up and go to work again the next day; and the women, the home life there, they say "Don't talk about wages to us; give us a descent standard of living; that is what we want."

Senator PHIPPS. Now, I ask you what is your information as to the percentage of employees who work the 12-hour shift in the steel plants? Do you know?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are operated on a 12-hour basis?

Senator PHIPPS. That is your information?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not know of any of the steel plants—and I refer particularly to those of the Steel Corporation—who have worked on the eight-hour basis for some years past?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I heard that there was one or two departments in connection with the process that work eight hours, but I have not tried to verify it.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it not the fact—

Mr. FITZPATRICK (interposing). The fact of the matter is that the industry is operated on a 12-hour basis. You have skilled men, skilled mechanics, higher paid men, may be able to get eight hours. They may be able to get \$20 a day, or \$40 a day, or \$60 a day, but that is not it.

Senator PHIPPS. You would not call those rates a mere pittance—\$40, or \$60 a day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The way they have got to earn it, yes. It is worse than a pittance. But the great body of men, there are a few skilled men and then there are thousands upon thousands of these ordinary laborers doing the roughest kind of hard, laborious work, and these men are working the 12 hours and doing the work for 40 cents an hour.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And it would be—well, there is no comparison with the kind of life they have got to lead under conditions of that kind.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Fitzpatrick, let me ask you, what has been the effort of the American Federation of Labor, or the Amalgamated

Association of Steel Workers, to organize those day laborers in the mills? Has it ever been attempted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Or do you confine your efforts to the organization of skilled men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Effort has been made continuously, but the opposition to the control of the towns, and the Western part of Pennsylvania, has been such that these organizations can not operate there. Men's civil and legal rights have been absolutely shoved aside, and the autocracy of this corporation has been set up there, which dominates the entire situation, and the American Federation of Labor, with all of its force, was unable to bring any kind of hope into the lives of the men there. They were so crushed and so despondent that they could not raise their heads. We feel that that is a dangerous situation and that it is a menace to this government where the citizenship is reduced to that condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that part of Pennsylvania is not safe for democracy?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is absolutely no democracy there. It is a tyranny and an autocracy, and I do not think that the equal of it ever existed in Russia.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you lived in Pittsburgh at any time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Only for a week or two weeks at a time.

Senator PHIPPS. But you were not inside the mill inclosures during those visits?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. You made reference to the padrone system of labor. Have you any knowledge of the existence or the attempt to institute that system within recent years, since it was prohibited under the laws of the United States?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have systems there that work out even worse than the padrone. They have employment agencies, and their discharge of the employees, and their rehiring, and all of these things, are applied to these foreigners, who have no protection, who are just there like dumb, driven cattle. They are all applied. We have made mention of the padrone system to show a system, to show that these terrible things have got existence, but not in the manner and form in which it is applied; it may not be just as the padrone system is ordinarily understood, but it is worse.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, on a twelve hour shift, we will say in the steel mills, you have the various men, the heaters, the rollers, and the helpers, the men at the saws, the men taking the steel away from the cooling beds, and all of that. Do those men work continuously during their shift?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They work seven days a week, and when they have the swing shift there they work 24 hours a day.

Mr. RUBIN. Twenty-two.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Twenty-four.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by that?

Senator PHIPPS. Changing from night turn to day turn, in special cases, he works through the 24 hours. Those are very exceptional cases in my mind.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is once every seven days.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know of any steel mill that works seven days a week?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is one of the demands of the men, that the six day week obtain.

Senator PHIPPS. But you are not answering my question. I am asking you, and you are the witness, do you know of any plant where the seven day plan is in operation, other than perhaps blast furnaces, which must be kept under fire all the time—do you know of any mill that works continuously seven days a week?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The complaint of the men generally is that the mills are operated on a seven-day basis, and they want to have them operated on a six-day basis. They are operated on a two shift basis, and the men want them operated on a three shift basis.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes. That is what I wanted to get at.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, there may be exceptions. There may be slight exceptions here that would show that that is not general; that it is not a general thing; but the information that we have is that the situation is general, and that the complaint is general that they want these reliefs.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, you speak of this great body of men who are doing common labor in the mills, these foreigners, many of them, whom you have been unable to organize. They do not work twelve hours?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have organized them, Senator. We have organized them.

Senator PHIPPS. You say you have them organized?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. We have not said that we have been unable to organize them. We say, in spite of all the opposition, and all the power and influence of the Steel Trust, that we have organized the employees of the steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. Do those men work a 12-hour shift, the day laborers, or does that only prevail where they are working in connection with the continuous operation of a mill, where they are taking away the product in rolls, or something of that sort? Does not the 10-hour day prevail for day labor in a majority of the plants, and with all the day laborers except those specially employed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The situation is such that the corporation can not suffer injury. The corporation can work 6 hours, 8 hours, 10 hours, or 12 hours, because their wages are based on an hourly proposition. If a man works 1 hour, he gets paid for 1 hour. The industry is based on a two-shift proposition, which is a 12-hour day. There may be a few instances where men only work 10 hours, or where men in connection with some operation only work 8 hours, but the vast majority of them work 12 hours, and the industry itself is on a 12-hour basis, and the demand is that the industry be put on an 8-hour basis, and that the wage rates on an 8-hour basis be standardized, so that decent standards of life will come into the homes of the men employed in the steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. Then, so far as the men employed by the hour are concerned, the mill owners would have no particular object in insisting that they should work 12 hours if they are paying them by the hour, would they?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have.

Senator PHIPPS. What is their object?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** It destroys everything on the face of the earth that is of value to them.

**Senator PHIPPS.** No; I am asking you what would be the object of the owners of the mill in requiring that their men whom they pay by the hour should work 12 hours a day instead of 8 hours?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Men who are brutalized in that way do not feel themselves as free men. They feel that they are serfs, and they take on the spirit of the serf, and they go on their way in humble submission to the authority that is above them. If they worked the 8-hour day, the spirit of Americanism would come into their lives. They would wish to surround their wives and children with better homes, better food, greater opportunity, and try to develop their children, so that they might grow into the kind of American citizens that we want to have in this country.

**Senator PHIPPS.** Now, in answer—

**Mr. FITZPATRICK** (interpsing). They do not want to get that thought or idea into the men's minds. They want to keep these long hours and these harsh conditions upon them, so that they will go on in submission with their heads bowed.

**Senator PHIPPS.** Now, that is your answer to my question, that you think there is reason for believing that a 12-hour shift is insisted upon for those paid by the hour, in order that the mill owners might have more control and dominate the employees. Has it not occurred to you that the mill owners should be wise enough to see that a man who works 12 hours per day can not do as much work on the average per hour as the man who works 8 hours per day? Would they not be standing in their own light if they insisted on a 12-hour day where it was unnecessary?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** You would think so, but the employer, in dealing with labor, has been the most blind and ignorant of the entire citizenship of our country. They have had some kind of a desire for control in their minds that has brutalized them in dealing with their employees, and regardless of what benefits they might get out of it, this desire to control has superceded that, and they bring about these awful conditions that exist in the steel and in other industries.

**Senator PHIPPS.** You have stated that the 24 associations consist of a membership, or have a membership, of 2,000,000 men, is that correct?

**Mr. RUBIN.** Over that.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Over that. Correct?

**Senator PHIPPS.** Is that correct?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Over.

**Senator PHIPPS.** That was stated by Attorney Rubin, I believe?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes.

**Senator PHIPPS.** Now, of the employees of steel companies in the United States, do we understand that the figure of half a million which has been mentioned here, embraces the employees of the United States Steel Corporation only, or does it embrace all steel manufacturing companies? Does the 500,000 mean the United States Steel Corporation employees, or does it mean employees of all steel producing companies in the United States?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** We figure that as the steel industry, that there is about 500,000 men—that is reported more or less—but we take the round figure of 500,000.

Senator PHIPPS. Does not the Steel Corporation have in excess of that number of employees itself?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have quite a number of employees, yes, that probably would not enter into the situation at all.

Senator PHIPPS. I was speaking of steel employees—steel workers?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, we think that the figures of the employees in the steel industry that would come within the jurisdiction of our organization might be about 265,000, or something like that.

Senator PHIPPS. What percentage of that 265,000 do you claim to have organized?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We think we have got them all.

Senator PHIPPS. You think you have got them all?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You have referred, once or twice, or used the expression, "International Organization."

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Will you explain to the committee why these 24 organizations are setting up as International Organizations, what is the meaning of that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, you see, the various trades and callings in this country had been organized a long what we call craft lines, such as boot and shoe workers. All the boot and shoe workers have their own organizations, their locals, in Chicago and Boston and Brocton, and all the various other cities. Then these locals get gother and form a national organization, a national or an international organization. Now, the same way with the cigar makers, and the plumbers, and the carpenters, and the horseshoers, and the rest of the trades. An organization may confine its activities to the United States, or it may broaden out its activities to Canada or Mexico, then they say, "International."

Senator PHIPPS. That is the information I wanted to bring out.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is why the term, "International," is used.

Senator PHIPPS. I think it might be advisable to adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fitzpatrick, will you be here at 2.30?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn until 2.30, then.

(Whereupon at 1 o'clock p. m., a recess was taken until 2.30 o'clock p. m., of the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 2.30 o'clock p. m.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Phipps, Wolcott, Walsh, and Sterling.

Also present: John Fitzpatrick, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor and organizer for the American Federation of Labor.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN FITZPATRICK—(Resumed).

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will proceed.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Fitzpatrick, you referred to an appropriation having been made by the United States Steel Corporation for the purpose of combatting the efforts of your organization to unionize the employees. About what time was that appropriation made?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understood it was about 18 years ago and that an amount of money had been stated—different amounts, of \$2,000,000, and in some instances it was reported to be \$20,000,000, to destroy the influence of organized labor.

Senator PHIPPS. You had no definite, or have you any definite knowledge of that appropriation, other than a mere statement or rumor which came to you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; only we have felt the effects of it; the organizations have been destroyed in the big steel mills.

Senator PHIPPS. For what length of time has the American Federation been endeavoring to organize the employees of the United States Steel Corporation and its various subsidiary plants?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would say that we have been continuously trying to organize them. We ceased to try to organize groups of mechanics in different localities as the requests came from the workers in meeting with their fellow citizens in the various fraternal organizations and church organizations, or wherever they met, they discussed the conditions of labor, and the men would realize how far down in the scale they were, and how much freedom the organized men had brought into their lives, and they wanted to bring themselves up to the same standard and they would express the desire that the men be called together, and that way a continuous agitation for organization was carried on.

Senator PHIPPS. My question refers to the specific work, extending over a period of time, for the purpose of organizing the steel workers employed in the United States Steel Corporation. Do you understand that has been continuous over the past 18 or 20 years?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Then in your statement of this morning, I believe you said that at a certain date, we will say in June of 1919—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. 1918.

Senator PHIPPS. June of 1918, about 100,000 steel workers had joined your organization. Is that correct?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; June, 1919.

Senator PHIPPS. June, 1919, as I understood it. Now, you referred to that convention of the American Federation of Labor which was held, I believe you stated, in June of 1918, and it was the consensus of opinion at that time that efforts to organize and unionize the steel industry should be made or continued. Now, I will ask you if any definite appropriation was voted for that purpose at that time, either to cover the employees of the steel corporation or of the steel industry generally?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. There was none?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. May I ask if in compliance with the requests which you said came from different districts, such as the Pittsburgh district, to organize their men, from what fund you were paying your organizers that were sent out to form the organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The general organizers of the various organizations that were assigned to the work, to make a concentrated effort to organize the steel workers, in response to their demands that they be given an opportunity to organize and to meet with their fellow workers and discuss these matters of vital importance to them.



Senator PHIPPS. And their compensation came out of the general fund of your organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were the general organizers of the various international unions.

Senator PHIPPS. And you testified that no definite appropriation was voted at this convention in St. Paul for the purpose of organizing the workers of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any knowledge of any appropriation having been voted by the Federation of Labor or the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, along about the year 1902, amounting to \$1,000,000, for the purpose of organizing the employees of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it not possible that you may have confused the statement that that appropriation which I referred, and state on information coming to me, was made, as the one to which you referred as having been made by the Steel Corporation to oppose the interests of the steel workers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There was no such action ever taken by the American Federation of Labor in convention, or by any of its affiliated organizations.

Senator PHIPPS. I merely bring that out to illustrate that this fund that you were testifying to this morning, on your belief, which may or may not have been based on a rumor—I wanted to know whether or not it was a rumor. I am making a statement of information which comes to me, of which I have no proof, and it was to the effect that that appropriation of a million dollars was voted by a convention of the Federation of Labor, I believe, held in Niagara Falls, I believe in the year 1901 or 1902, for the purpose of organizing the employees of the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No such action was ever contemplated or taken to my knowledge in the convention of the American Federation of Labor.

Senator PHIPPS. Has there been a definite appropriation made for the purpose of carrying on this present strike in the steel industry?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A definite appropriation?

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; any amount of money set aside for that purpose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The organizations cooperating prorate an amount between them to carry on the work of organization and carry on the campaign of organization.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the aggregate amount of that appropriation to-day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, I do not know what the aggregate would be, but the prorated amount would be—I do not think it would exceed \$60,000.

Mr. RUBIN. The total amount.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean the total amount?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is \$5,000 a month, the total amount.

Senator PHIPPS. To pay for your organizers and to carry on the strike which is now under way, and has been since the 22d instant?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That does not enter into it at all, Senator. The campaign committee that carried on the work of organizing the

steel industries is composed of 24 international unions. Now, in the first place, they assign either general organizers to the work, and in conjunction with them they prorate an amount of not to exceed \$5,000 a month between them for the headquarters, the work of the committee itself, the organizers and secretaries, and so on. That does not—the total amount of that does not exceed \$60,000.

Senator PHIPPS. You said that the 24 organizations, taken together are only contributing in the aggregate \$5,000 a month?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not to exceed \$5,000.

Mr. RUBIN. He means about this strike.

Senator PHIPPS. I mean for the strike.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, we have not taken that question up yet. That question has not come up yet.

Senator PHIPPS. This \$5,000 per month limit, then, merely pertains to the uses of the organizers that you have in the various meetings?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; the amount used to carry on the organization campaign.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, who will determine what amount shall be appropriated by the American Federation of Labor for strike purposes?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The international unions, when the question is put up to them, they will be solely within their right to decide in what way and to what extent they are going to sustain this strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Do their representatives meet in assembly to determine that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Do you say the international unions?

Senator PHIPPS. International unions. These are international unions.

Senator STERLING. Then, you mean other than these organizations in this country would have something to say in regard to the matter, would they?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know what you mean.

Senator STERLING. Suppose it related to a strike in this country, a steel strike affecting the steel workers in the different steel works in this country, would it be for the international unions to determine the amount to be raised to carry on that strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The 24 organizations cooperating here, of course, will ask for cooperation and assistance from other international unions, and we expect to get it.

Senator PHIPPS. I wanted to ask you if your organizers were sent to the Pittsburgh district and to other steel districts within the last six months before requests were received from the workmen that they desired admission to your organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, our organizers have been at Pittsburgh and around these various places all the time.

Senator PHIPPS. Those in Chicago to whom you referred this morning did not wait for invitations to go to the different steel districts and organize their employees.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, when the campaign was opened up, it was opened up in the Chicago District, and when that was organized whatever resources we had there we could utilize elsewhere in re-

sponding to the demands made by the workers in Pittsburgh, and they were sent over there.

Senator PHIPPS. I understood you to testify this morning that your efforts to organize workers in various steel plants in McKeesport, Duquesne, and other sections of the Pittsburgh District met with opposition on the part of the business interests of those small towns.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. That is to say, the grocers and the butchers discouraged the men from joining the union.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; I say that the mill town officials, who are owned body and soul by the Steel Corporation, the burgesses, are interested in these corporations, and they dictate and dominate the entire community of the town; and instances they went to the business men and told them that they would be put out of business unless they carried out the policy of the Steel Corporation, and that these businesses would not be permitted to carry on their business there.

Senator PHIPPS. Have any of the business men of those towns given you that information?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You have interviewed them on that subject?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not personally, but the information has come to our committee and organizers.

Senator WALSH. May I inquire if the properties in which these business men are located are owned by themselves individually or are they the properties of the Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In some instances it is owned by the Steel Corporation; and at the present time the men who are on strike and who live in property owned by the Steel Corporation are told that they will be evicted.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that true in the Pittsburgh district?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; in Homestead.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you furnish us with the names of some of those men who have been threatened.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When you desire the exact information I can furnish the names of the men who have been threatened in that way.

Senator WOLCOTT. You say that they have been evicted, not threatened?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Threatened with eviction?

Senator WOLCOTT. Threatened with eviction?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. "If you don't go back to work we are going to put you on the street, you and your family, and you will not get a place to live in this city." And some have been threatened with jail sentences. They meet the citizens of these towns, the officials of the towns, and the mill guards and gun men, and they say, "You go to jail or go to work; either one or the other."

Senator STERLING. Are you quoting exactly what they say, now? You are quoting exactly what they say now, are you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; as the information is furnished to me by the organizers there in those districts.

Senator STERLING. You have never never heard them speak that way yourself?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not been there.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you furnish us the names of men who have heard them say these things?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; our organizers there will give you any abundance of evidence on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. You are simply quoting what has been reported to you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. For instance, in McKeesport, yesterday, the mounted policemen were driving the men out of a hall. They secured a hall there to have a meeting in, and the mounted policemen were driving the men out of there on the street, and they won't let two men talk together on the street, and the citizenship of McKeesport is so terrorized at this moment that they will not talk to one another. If you can imagine that in America, that is the picture of McKeesport.

Senator WALSH. What is the population of McKeesport?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I could not tell you, but I would imagine that it was about 150,000.

Senator PHIPPS. About one-third of that, I should say.

Senator WALSH. To what extent does the Steel Corporation own property for rental for business purposes and for homesteads in these localities?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I can not furnish that information.

Senator WALSH. Can you secure that information?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know whether we will be able to get that or not.

Senator WALSH. There are some localities, you know, where a mill establishment owns everything, where the stores are located, where the meeting halls are located, and where the people live; they own the whole thing practically; all the property in the community. What I want to know is to what extent that situation obtains in these localities?

Mr. RUBIN. I would like to answer that for Mr. Fitzpatrick. Mr. Fitzpatrick was wired to come here on Thursday, and hardly had time to get that information. We understood that all we were to testify here to-day were these lawless conditions in Pittsburgh and the vicinity as encouraged by the other side; in other words, to present to you a picture of the situation, calling for more thorough investigation. Perhaps the committee might appoint a subcommittee to go to Pittsburgh, where we can give you first-hand information.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, if the committee went into McKeesport I presume there would be absolute harmony in McKeesport while the committee was there; if the committee went to the next town there would be absolute harmony in that town, and there would be direct recognition of the laws, ordinances, and rights of citizenship. I dare say if our organizers were to go into McKeesport with the committee there would be no difficulty in having a meeting there, but the minute the committee's back was turned the same conditions we are meeting with there to-day would be applied to us. That is not the remedy. If the members of this committee would go with our organizers without the knowledge of the public or the mill-town officials, or the guards, or the mounted police, just go into some of those places, and then see the treatment that

our organizers—that is accorded the citizenship of those places—then you would have something that would open the eyes of the committee as to the dangers in America.

Senator WALSH. Some of us want to stay here until after we have voted on the treaty, because we might get shot.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am very much in that condition myself, Senator. When I go into western Pennsylvania I kiss my wife and babies good-by, absolutely, because I do not ever expect to see them again.

Senator WALSH. It is as bad as that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Answering a question which was asked the witness, and which he was not competent to answer, the estimated population of McKeesport for the year 1918 was given at 48,299. It probably exceeds 50,000 at the present time.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, in reading the list of demands this morning, you did not include the demand for the check-off system being granted the men. Is that because you attach little importance to it, or what is the reason for making that demand on the employers, which is that they retain out of the pay of each employee a certain amount of money, which they are notified of by an official of the American Federation of Labor, which constitutes the man's dues in the organization, and which, instead of passing through his hands, is turned over by the paymaster of the plant to the treasurer of your local lodge?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I said, that practically is a proposition that would only be raised under certain circumstances and conditions; and that where it was raised, if it was agreed upon by the employer and employees, well, who is going to dispute it; who is going to kick about it? Who is going to dispute it if the employer and the employees agree upon it? Hundreds of men in industry in this country agree to that and do it with their men. It is acceptable, and there is no complaint about it.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the purpose or object of the company collecting the dues of the workman for his membership in a lodge, instead of permitting that member of the lodge to pay it for his own account?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is just a method which the unions and the companies have developed among themselves to transact their business.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, in your 20 years' experience in labor circles. Mr. Fitzpatrick, I want to ask you if it is not the fact that in a number of cases where the check-off system does not prevail that members of the union have neglected and refused to pay their dues, and if that is not the reason why you desire to have the employers act as a collecting agency?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Just like in fraternal organizations and other organizations, men fail to pay their dues, and it sometimes causes friction. Rather than have the friction exist, the employers and workers agree that they will do it in that way. It is only just a matter of transacting a little financial arrangement between them, which is agreeable to all of them.

Senator PHIPPS. It is a very strong element, however, in the matter of conducting a closed shop, is it not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know that it would apply at all. Of course, we are not agreed on what the "closed shop" is. The expression "closed shop" is a misnomer. It is a phrase that has been used to injure organized labor. We do not use it. We say "union shop."

Senator PHIPPS. We would like to give you an opportunity to make that clear, Mr. Fitzpatrick. What is your understanding of the closed shop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A "closed shop" is a place where the employer is in absolute control and will not permit union men to be employed.

Senator PHIPPS. How about the absolute reverse situation, where none but union men are permitted to labor? What do you call that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a union shop.

Senator PHIPPS. A unionized shop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; a union shop.

Senator PHIPPS. That is what I wanted to bring out.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any issue there of the closed shop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. None whatsoever, only as it is broached by Judge Gary. Judge Gary feels that the question is very much misunderstood, and that he may puzzle the public or may get them into a quandary. He injects that into the situation for the purpose of confusing the public and for no other reason.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it in your demands or is it not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. On the floor of the Senate yesterday it was charged by Senator Thomas, Record, page 6221, referring to this:

I have said the ultimate purpose is the closed shop.

He said that in a speech, and I think if that was a mistake he would be glad to be enlightened. I ask you, is the purpose of this strike the closed shop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The strike at the present time is brought about by the refusal on the part of Judge Gary to meet a conference. There is nothing else involved in the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all that is involved?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We did not stop when we met with our first rebuff. We started in in May, with convention of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers; in June, by the president of the American Federation of Labor; then by the action of the workers in authorizing their officials to insist upon a conference, through the strike vote, which was given; in the presentation of the matter in August to Judge Gary and refusal. After all this was done, then we presented the matter to the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. We have been over that. Let's get down to brass tacks.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Just let me make that complete, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we have had all that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In September, then, the President could not arrange that conference, and the men decided that, inasmuch as this corporation was so arrogant, so tyrannical, that it would refuse to hearken to the Chief Executive of this nation, that they would leave the mills themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Then came the strike.

Are we correct, now, in saying that your testimony is that the strike was called because of the refusal of Judge Gary to have that conference?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, did you submit certain demands, some 12 demands?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; we circulated 12 demands.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you submit those demands to the Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not directly. Our committee had these matters in hand, and if the judge or his associates, or whatever committee he might have referred the matter to, had met with us, we would have then presented these propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are the demands that you intended to present at the conference, those 12 demands?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Ycs.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is the closed shop in any of those demands?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question about that, is there?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely no question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to be perfectly frank about that. So that the statement on the floor by the Senator that the issue is really the closed shop, you say is a mistake?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The closed shop is—our committee, with President Gompers as chairman, in making reply to Judge Gary, stated that the closed shop is not even mooted.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that, too, do you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir. I was a part of the committee that answered the judge's letter.

The CHAIRMAN. I just wanted to make that clear.

Senator PHIPPS. This general question of the closed shop versus the union shop, there seems to be a little difference of opinion. I think a great many people look upon the closed shop as one in which only union labor may find employment; and an open shop, however, as one where both union and nonunion labor may find employment, and that is what it is claimed by Judge Gary that the Steel Corporation is, as we understand the letter read into the testimony this morning.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, of course, the misnomer of the situation has its two angles. They say the open shop and the reverse of this, the closed shop, but we do not deal in the term at all. We say the union shop or the nonunion shop. The nonunion shop is where union men and nonunion men may work together, and the union shop is a shop that is in agreement with the union.

The CHAIRMAN. You define the closed shop as one where union and nonunion men may work?

Mr. RUBIN. Where no union man can work.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A shop where the employers are in control, absolutely. It is the same in the open shop—

The CHAIRMAN. Then the union shop is that where both union men and nonunion men can work?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what the employers say; they make that representation to the public; that the open shop is where the citizen,



exerting his citizenship rights, can work when and where and for whom he pleases.

The CHAIRMAN. Whether he is a member of the union or not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what they say. But the fact of the matter is that no union man can get in there. It is closed, absolutely closed, to union men. That is the open shop.

Senator STERLING. In the union shop are nonunion men permitted to work?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes.

Senator STERLING. You are striving to have all the shops unionized, are you not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; certainly.

Senator STERLING. And you object in a union shop to the taking in of nonunion men, do you not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator STERLING. Do you not try to prevent the employment of nonunion men in the union shop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the union shop the employer and employees have agreed that the union men will be employed. Then the union takes the other step, and says that in case of inability of the union to furnish union men or of the employer to secure union men, that in that situation, then the employer can employ nonunion men, or whomsoever he can secure.

Senator STERLING. That is only, however, in case he is unable to secure union men that he is permitted to employ nonunion men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. Well, when there are union men out of employment, the employer agrees to give them preference.

Senator STERLING. In other words, he may employ union men. He has no objection to employing men because they are union men, but yet he desires to be free, if his business requires it, to employ other than union men, and you object to that, do you, unless, indeed, there are no union men to be had?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. The employer agrees with the organization, for the best interest of his business, for the best interests of the industry and of the community that union standards and union conditions will obtain. Then if there are any union men out of employment, that the union men will be given preference. If the supply is exhausted, then, so that no injury will be done to the contracting parties, they can bring in anybody they wish to employ.

Senator STERLING. In the event there is no such agreement between the union men and the employer to begin with—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then you have not got a union shop.

Senator STERLING. But the employer employs union men and has no objection to it. Then the union men object, do they not, to the employer employing other than union men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, they proceed to organize them and to bring them into the union.

Senator STERLING. Try to organize them and prevent the employment of any other than union men in the shops?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The men who are outside of the fold of the union are brought in, and the men in the union try to exert their influence over them and bring them into the union. They work with them, discuss the situation with them, and reason with them, and point out the great injury they are doing to themselves and to

the community and to their own children; that they are making it impossible for their own children to get any measure of justice or to get decent treatment, or be able to live as men and women should live. They try to induce them to come in and tell them those things. Then these men see the light, not for themselves, but for the future of their own children, and they come in with the others.

Senator STERLING. Now, let me ask you this. The fact that the employer of both union and nonunion men seeks to exercise his right, in case of his business needs, to employ nonunion men, is a source of friction, is it not, between the union men in the shop and the employer?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is not the employer's right—

Senator STERLING. No. Answer my question yes or no. Is it not a source of friction between the employer and the union men in the shop because the employer insists on his right, according to his needs, to employ nonunion men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. I would say no.

Senator JONES. What do you call that kind of a shop where they employ both union and nonunion men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A nonunion shop.

Senator JONES. A nonunion shop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. I think we have understood that to be known as the "open shop."

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is very unfortunate, Senator. I say that this misnomer gives the wrong impression.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe it is the general impression, however.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, that is too bad.

Senator WOLCOTT. It is only a matter of description; that is all.

Senator WALSH. There are three classes: the closed, union, and nonunion shop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; we only have the union and the nonunion shop.

Senator WOLCOTT. Is not this the situation: From the viewpoint of the labor organizations the proper terminology is the union and nonunion shop; and from the viewpoint of the employers, the terminology, at least frequently, is the closed shop and open shop? Is not that about it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You read the names signed to the letter presented to Judge Gary, requesting a conference. Will you be good enough to read those names again? You gave from memory the men who joined with you in signing that letter? You remember the men who accompanied you to New York to request that conference, do you not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was in doubt as to one name. I can give you the names from memory.

There were John Fitzpatrick, William Hannon, David J. Davis, William Z. Foster, and Edward J. Evans.

Senator PHIPPS. Was Mr. Tighe a member?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Those were the five signers. Of course, we know you are not employed by the Steel Corporation, but I want to ask you if Mr. Hannon is employed by the Steel Corporation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What was his occupation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He is executive board member of the International Association of Machinists.

Senator PHIPPS. He was not directly interested as a steel worker, in the steel business? Was there a Mr. D. J. Davis?

Senator STERLING. I do not think the witness answered your last question.

Senator PHIPPS. He said he was an executive board member of the International Association of Machinists.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And then the Senator said he was not employed in the steel industry.

Senator STERLING. Yes; I did not hear your answer to that question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, he is not directly employed by the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator PHIPPS. How about Mr. Davis?

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the membership of his organization is composed of employees of the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, as to Mr. Davis.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Davis is the acting president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel & Tin Workers.

Senator PHIPPS. Has he any other employment?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. The membership of his organization—that is, a large portion of the membership of his organization—is composed of employees of the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Mr. Edward Evans. How is he employed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He is the representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and a large number of the members of his organization are employed by the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator PHIPPS. The other was Mr. William Z. Foster?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Foster is the general organizer of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, and secretary of the national committee. The members of his organization are employed in the steel industry.

Senator STERLING. Does he belong to the international organization too, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator STERLING. What is his international organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by this international organization, that Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America? Does that extend abroad into other nations?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I explained this morning, where the term "international" is used, is where these organizations have membership in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that membership in Canada—we understand that—have anything to do with this strike? Or, membership in Hungary or Austria?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It does not go to Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The membership is confined to this North American Continent.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the order in Canada ever have anything to do with a strike in this country?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are no steel mills over in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, take the carmen, Mr. Foster's organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have their organization over there in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but do they have anything to do with saying when a strike shall be called in this country?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they contribute anything in carrying on the strike in this country?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That matter has not been determined. We expect that they will.

Senator WOLCOTT. Mr. Fitzpatrick, when the strike vote was taken, will you just describe to the committee the method by which the issues were formulated and laid before the men upon which they were to be asked to pass their judgment?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The matters were printed, and not only in the English language, but in other languages, for fear that some of them might not thoroughly understand, and that they would have knowledge in their own language as to the proposition.

Senator WOLCOTT. There were 10 or 11 issues, I forget the exact number—you desired to present to Judge Gary—10 or 11 wasn't it?

Mr. RUBIN. Twelve.

Senator WOLCOTT. Twelve?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, now, I do not know that you can approach it in that way. The purpose of the conference committee was to go to Judge Gary and ask him to meet the representatives of the organizations involved, so that they might discuss these things, and then if that arrangement was made, that opportunity given to the employecs, he being assured then that he would have some protection, and that these matters would be considered, and then they could be brought in under that protection that we had arranged for them. But this conference committee that went to ask for the conference was not the committee that was to negotiate the matters that they wished to present. They were just to arrange the conference.

Senator WOLCOTT. But what I want to get at is this: To ascertain whether or not the men, the individual men in the various lodges or local unions, indorsed by their ballot these specific requests which this committee sought an interview with Judge Gary for the purpose of arranging a discussion on?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. How were these particular subjects laid before the men for an expression of opinion on?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were printed and distributed among them, and in the meetings the matters were discussed; that is, wherever we were able to hold meetings. In Rankin and other places in the Chicago district, where we had our citizenship rights, and the Constitution of the United States still obtains, these matters were discussed and debated, and finally decided upon; but in certain places in western Pennsylvania, where we could not meet, or could not discuss, we tried to circulate the matter by a circular.

Senator WOLCOTT. Was there anything like a ballot, anything similar to a ballot prepared, listing the demands that were desired to be made?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Oh, yes; a ballot was distributed and cast.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** And the men were asked to vote for or against a strike, in order to enforce these specific demands that were thrashed out? Is that correct?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Their own desires were put into form, and then they were asked to vote upon the proposition as to whether they would insist upon having their grievances and matters considered by the corporation.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** Well, I understand that; but I want to know how it was ascertained that the men were interested in these twelve particular things; whether the men by their votes specifically passed on those things, or whether they gave a sort of blanket authority to their general officers to formulate demands for them.

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** The various meetings, various organizations had discussed these matters, and as they agreed upon them, then their organization would further discuss and consider it, and after the whole thing was boiled down, the consensus of opinion was that these were the things that the men wanted, and if they could secure these things, that that would, for the time being at least, establish a fairly decent situation in the steel industry.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** Of course, you men, you general officers, who were not present at the many meetings held, had no way directly of learning for yourselves what the men wanted. There must have come something up to you from the subordinate officials in order to enlighten you upon what it was the men wanted. What was it that thus came up to you, to show you what the great rank and file of these workers wanted?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Well, as I say, the matter was first discussed among the men.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** And you were not there among the men?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** No.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** What came up to you to show what they wanted?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Here are 24 international unions, and these 24 international unions have one or more locals in these various points. The men of that trade first got together and discussed it. If there are two or three locals of that trade, they got together and discussed it, and then they have a joint meeting of the representatives of these organizations. Then they get together and discuss it, and then they have a district meeting. We will say, for instance, the Calumet district, which takes in Joilet, Gary, Indiana Harbor, and South Chicago, and the representatives, then, of these localities get together in the district meeting, and then they further discuss it, and then each international union has a representative on the national committee for organized iron and steel workers. The local unions then, and the district officers and others, present their result; that is, the result of their discussion and debate, and talk to him. Then he goes into the national committee and presents it to the national committee. The national committee then thrash it out, and they come to a conclusion that that is the program which is sought.

**Senator WOLCOTT.** Is that machinery that you have laid out there the so-called voting machinery? Is that the way the vote is taken?

**Mr. FITZPATRICK.** Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. It is taken by reports, then, by the proper officials, from the local organization, on up to the top, but not a depositing of ballots?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes; the ballots are printed and distributed.

Senator WOLCOTT. Will you supply to this committee some sample ballots?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. I wish you would, please.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want you just to get this point, Senator, in connection with that question, that each of these international unions have their own method of transacting their business, and in this work we did not ask them to establish new methods of transacting their business. We just said, "Whatever is the method of your organization in transacting the business of your organization, you apply that method in this situation, and let us know the result."

So, if an organization votes by the Australian ballot, or if they vote by a showing of hands, or if they vote by a viva voce vote, or whatever method is employed by the international union in transacting their business, we asked them to take their vote in accordance with that, and then we got the result.

Senator WOLCOTT. Did the men state that it was their desire to give authority to call the strike if Judge Gary would decline to grant an audience to the committee, so to speak?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. That is one of the things they expressly voted upon, was it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. Or, if they had no hearing, then there should be authority to call the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. If they could not get a conference for the purpose of considering their grievances and providing methods of redress, that the international officers would have to set the date for the strike. That was only a matter of bringing about concerted action.

Senator WOLCOTT. Well, if you will please bear in mind to let us have samples of those ballots, we shall be obliged to you.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will you make a note of that, Mr. Rubin?

Mr. RUBIN. I will remember it.

Senator WOLCOTT. This morning you were speaking of the pauperized condition of the steel workers.

Senator JONES. Before you leave that other point, may I ask just one question?

Senator WOLCOTT. Yes.

Senator JONES. If I understand the situation, Mr. Fitzpatrick, it is this: That your men had discussed their grievances among themselves; they decided that they were very important subjects for adjustment, and wanted those matters taken up with Mr. Gary, or the officials of the steel corporation, and what the men decided was that if they could not have their grievances considered they would go on a strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator JONES. That was the point I wanted to bring out.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. They decided that in advance of your attempt to secure an interview with Mr. Gary?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anyone else to take the grievances to except Mr. Gary? Was he the regular spokesman in these matters of grievances?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If Mr. Gary had referred us to any other officials, we would have been glad to take it up with them. If he had told us to go to the foremen of the plant where these grievances were, we would have gone there.

The CHAIRMAN. How are grievances generally presented? Are they presented to Mr. Gary, or is there some committee connected with the Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The situation here has been air-tight, that there was to be no recognition of the rights of labor, and you could not employ any other means in dealing with the situation. You had to go to the head, and try to reason out the necessity of taking action; that the day of treating labor as so much brick and stone was wrong. They can not buy labor any more like they did before, and on that ground they asked the representatives, after considering the whole situation for months, to go to President Gary, and ask him to sit down and talk this situation over, and then we met with a stone wall, with absolutely no consideration.

Senator STERLING. May I ask there, Mr. Fitzpatrick, where were these 12 demands of which you speak first prepared or formulated?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were prepared as a result of the meetings of the national committee. The national committee had sessions about once a month since it was organized.

Senator STERLING. Did they prepare them and then submit them to the various local organizations?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator STERLING. That appears to be the action that you have described of the local union?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; first to discuss it in the local unions of the internationals.

Senator STERLING. But the discussion goes on upon these demands already formulated by the executive committee—

Mr. FITZPATRICK (interposing). I would not say that, Senator. We first discuss the general situation, and as they go on discussing it, they say, they conclude that certain things are essential to an understanding, and they minimize it to the very lowest point, and they say, "Now here are 12 propositions; one proposition is presented by the United Mine Workers of America; another proposition is presented by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; another proposition is presented by the International Association of Machinists; and all of these become international questions, and finally they agree that if these 12 propositions are made the basis of programs, or made a program, that they are willing to present that situation.

Senator STERLING. However, it is after the international organizations of which you speak have taken that action that the propositions, or, in this case, the 12 demands were submitted to the various local organizations?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It first came up from the rank and file, and up to the international organizations, and then clarified into 12 points, and then they were sent back to them, and they ratified it, as it were.

They say, "Now, if these points are conceded to you, will they be satisfactory for the time being?"

Senator STERLING. But the 12 points, as I understand you to say, were never submitted to Mr. Gary, the head of the United States Steel Corporation, personally?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator STERLING. Why weren't they?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He would not allow us to.

Senator STERLING. What you asked for was a conference, and the demands themselves were not presented directly to the United States Steel Corporation at all, either through Mr. Gary or anyone else, were they?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were to be.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, they were never presented, you never had a chance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We never had a chance to present them.

Senator STERLING. Now, is your strike on the ground that Mr. demands would not be complied with?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That we could not get a conference for the presentation of the grievances we would present.

Senator STERLING. Why did you not make a demand or submit the twelve policies to the steel corporation directly and then, if there was no compliance with your demands, or if there was a refusal to have a conference to discuss those demands which you had specifically presented, then base your strike on that rather than on the ground that a conference had been refused?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Were you present at the morning session, Senator?

Senator STERLING. No; I was only here a few minutes. I did not hear you this morning.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If you were present at this morning session you would have heard read the correspondence that was read to the committee, the effort of the committee to approach Judge Gary, and the absolute denial of that situation or suggestion by Judge Gary, through a messenger, that if we wanted to submit our matters in writing it might be referred to the proper official to answer, and then the answer of Judge Gary himself denying absolutely the right of the men to call upon him to represent his employers, or present anything to him, or that he would not discuss any question affecting the employees with a representative of labor, and then, after he had said that, we made another appeal to him and told him that if he desired our authority and would insist that that would have to be shown, that that would necessitate a strike, and we begged of him not to bring about a strike in this situation, and that was the only method we had of proving our representation of the employees, and we urged him that we wanted a conference for the purposes of considering the grievances of the men, the matter of wages, collective bargaining, the hours of labor, and some of living conditions of the families of the men. We brought those points to his attention, and then we told him—



Senator STERLING (interrupting). How did you do that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. By letter. We told him that we would be at the National Hotel here in Washington for two days awaiting his reply and we hoped that he would consider it and make answer to it, but that letter he ignored.

Senator STERLING. Have these 12 demands been made a part of the record here?

Senator WOLCOTT. Mr. Fitzpatrick, this morning you spoke of the wage to the steel worker, and said that they were such as to make the living conditions of the steel worker's family below the grade of living enjoyed by paupers. That statement arrested my attention because of the fact that yesterday, on another committee hearing, I heard the members' representatives of the railroad brotherhoods testify and they showed comparatively these receipts by men in the railroad service, passenger brakemen and so on, in comparison with the wages received by men in other industrial pursuits, and while I have not studied the tables submitted, yet my general impression from them is that the railroad workers, taking them on the average, received considerably less per day and per hour than do the steel workers. What have you to say with respect to that statement of the comparative wage between those two occupations, the railroad men and the steel men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know anything about the wages paid in the railroad industry, and the information that I have as to the steel industry is that the great volume of labor in the steel industry is common labor, and with very few exceptions there is what is called skilled labor, and while skilled labor may get a fairly decent wage, it is not anything like what he ought to have, no matter what he gets—some of them get \$20 and \$40, as I understand it, as high as \$60 a day, but for the work they do, that is not anything extraordinary, and they are entitled to more if they can get it. And that is only one thing, and is a very extraordinary instance. The large volume of labor in the steel industry is common labor, and the rate of pay there is about 40 cents an hour. When I say it was less than the pauper wage, as based on this information, that the secretary of the United Charities, of Chicago, has made this statement to me—I asked for the information. He said, "What does it cost the United Charities on an hourly wage basis? What does it cost the United Charities to furnish substance and shelter and so on to pauper families?" That is what I asked him. And he made this reply to that:

If a man was working on an eight-hour day and he was receiving 42 cents an hour, that, then, he would be able to purchase with the 42 cents an hour that which the United Charities had figured out that a family must have in order to live decently.

Senator PHIPPS. A family living decently is not a pauper family.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, of course, the United Charities does not treat a pauper family just like a mule, you know. They consider a pauper a human being, and they give them a standard of living, and what they do give them as paupers would cost 42 cents an hour of an individual's work.

Senator JONES. That includes the pay for the charities organization, does it not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, what they furnish to the families, what they actually furnish to the families in the way of food, heat, and clothing,

and light and shelter. There are the five things, and in each instance the United Charities furnishes the pauper family more than the worker's family can get by devoting their very best efforts in the steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. Your testimony this morning was to the effect that 40 cents per hour was the lowest rate paid; you were talking about common labor?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say the great volume of labor in the steel industry is common labor, and I take it from that that the great volume of labor in the steel industry was living at less than the pauper lived, and that is a sad situation to exist in America.

If you will permit this, I would like to make one other point. A professor of Columbia University was giving testimony before a Federal judge in the city of Chicago the other day in a labor hearing, and he made the statement that, from the evidence and statistics he has gained, he is convinced that the children of the working people of America are dying by slow starvation. Now, men, you can talk to me all you want to, and you can wrangle about this thing, but I say to you that it is the most dangerous situation that can confront this Nation when a professor of our country can say that our babies are dying of slow starvation, and these men, these fathers of these families, and the mothers of these families, are in the factories and mills and the workshops, and giving the very best of their vitality and energy to eke out an existence, and they are reduced to the pauper's standard of living, and their babies are slowly starving to death.

Senator PHIPPS. You stated this morning that you are not familiar with the wage scale; that you had no schedules in your office, nor did you have any data showing what the average wage of the Chicago district was, although you have been at the head of the organization for a number of years. I grant, if your statement is correct, that the majority of the employees were only receiving 40 cents an hour. That is a lamentable condition, but I do not wish to have your testimony go into the record without it being accompanied with the statement which you made this morning, which would not qualify you to testify to any such conditions existing.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I said that the organizations which comprise these 24 have all the data and information, and that this committee can get all that information if it is desired.

Senator PHIPPS. That is what we propose to do.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. For instance, you can get the knowledge and information here. There is no group that has better records, or has reasons to have better records, than the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, and they can furnish you the accurate information, and what the conditions of employment are, and usually can tell you the conditions there.

Senator PHIPPS. You admitted this morning that you were not familiar with that, and I wanted to have that clear in the record.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want to bring to your attention, Senator, that some of the workers in the Calumet district who were getting \$20 a day, and some of them \$30 per day, that the newspaper reporters went among them when they had a day off, a few days off, and they said, "What do you think of it?" They answered, "This is a God-send, this is a blessing, this is happiness."

Think of it, where a father has one day off with his baby, where he has got a chance, not to look at them in the morning before leaving, and in the evening after coming home, when they are asleep, but to play with them, and to take them to the movie shows. Do you know what happened in Gary, a town of thousands of inhabitants, with thousands of women and children, and my information is that there are two movie shows in that town. Why? Because the women and babies can not get any pleasure or enjoyment out of life. These women say, "Don't talk to us about money or wages. We have got good homes, and we have food, and we have clothes, and we have pleasure, but we have no happiness. Our life is a drudgery. We hate this situation."

Senator PHIPPS. Now, if they have a good home and clothing and food, how can they have it on any such wage as 40 cents an hour?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Those are not the 40 cents an hour people. I am talking about the \$20 a day and the \$40 a day men.

Senator PHIPPS. While you are on the subject of the daily wage, how many organizers of the American Federation of Labor are on its pay roll at the present time for the conduct of this strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How many——

Senator PHIPPS. How many organizers?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I could not tell you just exactly how many there were.

Senator PHIPPS. The strike—you are at the head and conducting the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, but as I told you, the international unions had their own men handle their own affairs. These international unions are handling their own organizers.

Senator PHIPPS. You ought to know how many there were. Do you know what they are paid, what rate they are paid?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I couldn't tell.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not know how they would compare with the average employee of the steel corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that the wage of the organizer is based on two propositions: If he is located in a locality where he lives, or if he has to go on the road. If he was a home man his salary would be about \$8 a day, and if he was a road man it would be \$6 a day for expenses.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean \$8 a day plus the \$6 a day for expenses?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If he is a home man it is \$8 a day, and if he is a road man he is given \$6 a day on the road on which to live.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any objection to stating what your own salary is at the present time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not at all. Up until the 7th day of September my wages were \$60 per week, and since September 7 the Federation of Labor has increased my wages to \$75 a week. That is my wages, paid by the Chicago Federation of Labor, \$75 per week, and I have got four more in the family. We are very frugal; we do not squander any money; we do not go on vacations; we do not have any theater parties or suppers.

Senator WOLCOTT. And no Pierce-Arrows?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. And with four members in the family, and I can say to you that I am not able to—I do not schedule an income tax report.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not schedule an income-tax report?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; I do not schedule; I do not have to schedule, because I have got along with less than that, but it does not fill the bill. Even \$75 a week won't fill the bill to a family that lives very frugally on the commonest kind of food and in quarters that ought not cost more than \$20 a month. I think that the house that I live in would bring about \$20 a month.

Senator STERLING. Do you get your traveling expenses besides?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And you get your expenses while traveling?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; I get railroad fare and hotel bills paid while I am on the road.

Senator PHIPPS. There is another point that I want to clear up in my mind, too. You testified as to the refusal of the head of the Steel Corporation to confer with your committee, and there were no employees of the Steel Corporation, with the exception of one or two on the committee, and you claimed to represent the men who are employees. Now, how about the attitude of the superintendents or foremen of the various steel plants when requests come to them from a mill committee to meet them on some question that comes up, hours of labor, the output, working conditions, or anything of that sort? Are those committees received by the superintendents or foremen, or do those superintendents refuse to confer with the mill committee at any time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the union mills?

Senator PHIPPS. In the Steel Corporation mills, and the other independent mills that are not unionized?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They do not meet the employees at all.

Senator PHIPPS. They take the attitude of the independent mills and steel corporations, working nonunion—their attitude is to refuse to receive the complaints or confer with committees of the men presenting such complaints?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The men have no way of getting any kind of consideration for their grievances or the matters which they want to present. Whatever arrangement is there, they know how it operates. It operates against them. It operates to crush them. And every effort to make complaint. All of the gumption and the pluck is taken out of the men in the steel mills. They just obey orders.

Senator PHIPPS. You think that condition has prevailed for a number of years?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Or is it a recent attitude?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That has been the result of the system that has been worked out for a period of 18 years, and now results in the situation that we have got to-day.

Senator STERLING. You spoke about men receiving \$60 per day.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Some men in the steel plant get \$60 a day.

Senator STERLING. The men who receive \$60 per day, what class of steel workers get \$60 per day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, I would not want to undertake to name them, but there are certain highly skilled jobs, and the man who fills that job is a very highly skilled man, and he also occupies a very dangerous situation, and his daily income might be lessened because he has to pay some assistants which he has, which he chooses himself,

not relying upon anybody else. He chooses these assistants, and it may be lessened to some extent in that way, and they grade him in the newspapers as this \$60 a day man of the Steel Corporation. He is the only one in probably 5,000.

Senator STERLING. There are a good many of these highly skilled men drawing these higher wages employed in the steel industries, are there not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think there are very, very few in comparison with the number of employees at the mill.

Senator STERLING. You spoke about \$30 a day men. What class of laborers or workmen in the steel industry get \$30 a day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Why, I say, I am not conversant with the operations of the mills; I am not conversant with the employment of these various men; only I know that the statement was given out to the press in order to make the people think that all of the men in the steel industry were getting anywhere from \$8, \$10, \$12, \$14, \$16, and up to \$60 a week. We admit there are some men getting \$60 a week, but there is only one in five or ten thousand, and the others are along down the line, and put them all together, they are only a mite in the situation. The great big body of labor in the steel mill is on a 40 cent an hour basis, and they are working 12 hours a day, 7 days in the week, 365 days in the year, and these are the things that they ask for. They say, "Don't talk about wages; we are not talking about wages. Give us some conditions; we want an eight-hour day; we want one day in seven; we want the right of collective bargaining; we want the intolerable oppression of the steel company upon us to be removed. We want to have some the rights of free men under a free country."

Senator STERLING. Are you sure about their working 12 hours a day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that a common thing in the steel industry, that the men of the various classes and the various kinds of work, work 12 hours a day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say it is generally so.

Senator STERLING. Is it true at Pittsburgh?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it true at Gary?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All through.

Senator PHIPPS. They work 12 hours a day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us anything about the profits of the steel company last year?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, not directly; I have not looked into the matter, but I heard—of course, this is hearsay—that during the period of the war, which was over 300 and some days—do you remember how many days we were in the war, how long we were in the war?

Mr. RUBIN. About a year and a half.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would be about 400 days, and they took down about a million dollars a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Profits?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; they took down about a million dollars a day while these very men were in the steel mills, and were taking it out of their stomachs, and were taking it off of their backs, and out

of the mouths of their babies, so that sufficient food and other things might be sent across the water to sustain our allies, and in the face of that situation, with these men giving up part of their very lives and doing the most necessary work to sustain the Nation, the Steel Corporation was taking down a million dollars a day.

Senator PHIPPS. You are sure—

Mr. FITZPATRICK (interrupting). And if they can find any comfort in that money, if any man can find comfort in that kind of money, why, they can have that kind of comfort.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, we can get the records of the company in order to find out what their profits were. But refer back again, if you please, to the twelve-hour day: Is it not a fact that where the men are on a twelve-hour turn, that their labor is not continuous. For instance, the rollers who have charge of the rolls, have intervals between heats, so that as a matter of fact, over the twelve-hour period they are not really employed for much more than half of that time. Is that right?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I could not say, Senator, but I would hate to think that the officials of the Steel Corporation would not give a man time to catch his breath.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, you have stated that you are not familiar with the operations in the steel mills—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; but they ought to have time to catch their breath in the press.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it not a fact that the men who earn the highest rate of wages are those who are paid on the tonnage basis, that is, the roller is paid for it upon the tonnage basis, so much per ton of the output, and the first and the second and the third helper accordingly, and even the engineers who run the engines driving the rolls are paid under the tonnage basis, and the men who work a certain machine in handling the steel in the rolling bed—are not they all paid on the tonnage basis?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, I have heard about these tonnage systems, but I understand that it is regarded as the curse of the industry.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know of any limitation being placed by the amalgamated association to the output of any certain mill, say the rolling of certain sizes of stock, or material, such as beams, channels, or angles, of any daily limitation on the output of any steel mills?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For instance, the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers agreed with their employers, in a number of instances, that they would not go with the destruction of human life, and they will agree that a certain amount of work is a fair and reasonable proposition, and they agree among themselves that that shall only be done; and in that way they save the life of the fellow who is doing the work. In contradistinction to that of the United States Corporation and its subsidiaries do not regard human life any more than so much material it is going to use up in the industry. One time they had the ports of this country wide open so that they could bring them over in boatloads. They would bring so many boatloads of ore down from the mines and so many boatloads of immigrants in from southern Europe, dump them all into the steel mill, pull out so much steel, take down so much profit, and then go on and do the same thing over again.

Senator PHIPPS. That is only from the theoretical standpoint.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; here is the way it worked. That is where we have got the situation on our hands. If Senators believe that we

haven't got something to consider, they are mistaken. Don't think for a moment that we haven't got a job on our hands.

Senator PHIPPS. I am not thinking that we haven't something to consider. Do not mistake me on that.

The CHAIRMAN. You think if there is any truth to the charge that the foreigners have brought on the strike, that there might be some responsibility upon the people who have brought the foreigners here.?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are no foreigners in this situation, Senator, unless you will take this situation—that if you happen to be born in China that you would be a Chinaman. That is not so. We are all foreigners. Every one of us are foreigners. Judge Gary is a foreigner. The only American is the Indian. And that is the thing that is going to be used. They are going to use this thing to the injury and detriment of those men who are here and who should get more protection if they were not citizens than if they were citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think you caught my point, Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I caught your point, that they are raising that question of foreigners; that that is brought in.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that they themselves have brought in these foreigners.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. You said a moment ago that they themselves have brought in these foreigners.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say because they are there in the steel mills, they appealed to us to organize them, to give them our help to bring them up out of their bondage, and we know that unless we do that they will drag us down where they are. We sought to bring them up to a higher and better standard of life.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a good deal of what we call Bolshevism among these workers in the steel mills?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The only Bolshevik I saw over there are the mill town officials and the men who deliberately defy the Constitution of the United States. Would you call this a Bolshevik? At Clareton, on Sunday, the boys went down to hold their meeting, to decide how they were going to handle the situation on Monday. They went in on the public common, provided by the community for the purpose of public gatherings; they had a platform there; an old man went over and nailed up a piece of board and then on the piece of board he nailed the American flag. Then they proceeded with their meeting. They started to discuss the situation, the interests of the community, and how the men must handle the situation, and without any knowledge or without a bit of information seven mounted cavalrymen rushed into that lot, rushed through these men, women, and children and scattered them all over the place, and the officer of the constabulary reached up and pulled down the American flag and threw it on the ground. They then started to divide up the men, women, and children who were scattered around there trying to get away from them. They had edged up along the fence to get away and they plunged their horses up against them. One woman and child were ridden down and trampled upon. One woman of large

proportions felt that she had better try to make safety for herself, and she was edging along the fence to get to a place where she thought there was an opening. One of these men on horseback plunged his horse at her, the horse's shoulder hit her and drove her up against the fence, knocked the fence down, and she tumbled out on to the street. That was in Clareton, the Sunday before the strike.

Senator JONES. Are not those officials elected by the very men who are working in the mills there?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I beg your pardon.

Senator JONES. Those officials that you spoke of who ran these people down, were not they elected by these men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; those are the constabulary of Pennsylvania.

Senator WOLCOTT. That is a State force, is it not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any of the other States have this constabulary force, if you know?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not that I know of. Every other State where it was attempted it was defeated.

Here is a picture of a mounted constabulary—we call them Cossacks, driving the people off the streets. There is no violation of law or order there; no attempt to go contrary to the law. Our organizers, when they go there to advise the men to live within the law, and how to handle the situation, why they are handled by the police and thrown out of there.

Here is a picture of our meeting before the Cossacks came. You can see what a peaceful gathering that is, with one of our organizers advising and talking with the men.

You will notice in this picture the horse is up on the sidewalk. They drive the men, women, and children off the sidewalk into the street. Then they get behind them and scatter them right and left, and club them. You will see men coming out from there, five or six of them, with blood streaming all over their heads. They have got them so terrorized that they won't talk to one another, because if they do they will get it worse, and the fellows that they talk to will get the same kind of treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of those constabulary are around that particular region?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It only takes about seven of them to handle a thousand or two thousand people. Just to give you an idea as to what they do, Mr. Chairman, at Butler—these men had their horses trained—one of our men was standing on the sidewalk and a mounted policeman came along. The man did not think he was going to be interfered with, because he was standing there looking around to see what was going on in the street. When the horseman got his horse maneuvered up close enough, the horse put his foot on the man's foot. Immediately the man put up his hand to shove the horse off and as soon as he did that the policeman struck the man down in cold blood. Then the man was arrested for resisting an officer.

The CHAIRMAN. The man who was struck down was arrested?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. He was arrested, jailed, and fined for resisting an officer. First the horse pinned him down on the street; then he was struck down by the policeman, and then he was jailed and fined.



The CHAIRMAN. Where did that occur?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That occurred in Butler, Pa.

Senator STERLING. You say the horse was trained to do that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say that these men have their horses trained. They are expert horsemen themselves, and they can do almost anything with them.

Senator PHIPPS. What plant is located in Butler—that is in Pennsylvania, I believe?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Standard Steel Car Co.

Senator PHIPPS. How long has the strike been under way there?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There has been a strike on there for about two months.

Senator PHIPPS. That is not in any way the property of the Steel Corporation, is it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know, unless the Standard Steel Car Co. is a subsidiary of the United States Steel.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions to be asked by the committee?

Senator JONES. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I should like to revert to some points that were mentioned rather early this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me, but I would suggest that each member of the committee ask the witness the questions that he desires to ask, and that he be not interrupted.

Senator JONES. I did not get it clear in my mind as to the reasons for organizing the workers in the Steel Corporation. I wish you would make that a little plainer, Mr. Fitzpatrick, as to why you have undertaken to get the employees of the Steel Corporation into the Federation of Labor.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, of course, the statement I made was, Senator, that we had always had an effort; we were continuing the effort to organize the various branches of the steel industry. The men in the mills themselves of course have been so terrorized, every spark of manhood has been crushed out of them; they have become so servile that they dare not assert themselves in any way around the mills. Now, outside of the mills, they come in contact with our men and they urge our men, plumbers, and different mechanics, whom they meet in the locality and talk to, they say "for God's sake, why don't you try to organize our fellows."

Senator JONES. That is just the point I wanted to bring out, Mr. Fitzpatrick. This morning it was not made clear that there was that insistent demand by the employees of the Steel Corporation itself. Rather the opposite inference was left in the record, as I gathered it, that the incentive, the motive for organization came from the organization itself, to further its influence and so on, and you did not make it clear this morning that the employees of the Steel Corporation were insisting upon your bringing them into the organization.

Mr. RUBIN. The letter to the President covers that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, the letter to the President covers that. I think the action of the steel men themselves, Senator, has proven it beyond a doubt.

Senator JONES. It was just that point that I wanted to bring out clearly.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think there is any more evidence needed on the situation than the voluntary action of the men themselves. This is the first opportunity they have had in twenty years to assert themselves, and they have done it in such vast numbers, and done it without a loud word; a loud word has not been spoken among themselves, as is shown here, only where the authorities started in to override them and abuse them and beat them down. Then of course they were not able to defend themselves.

Our men in jail. There are 150 men in jail now at Newcastle. I do not know how many there are in jail at other points, but they are using all of these forces to intimidate the men and terrorize them.

As we were saying, this demand comes up from below, of course, and we knew how hopeless they were. we knew how hopeless our own effort would be if there was only one organization directing its continuation against the power of the steel trust. So, the American Federation of Labor, in the face of this situation, brought all of the organizations that have interests in the steel industry together in a meeting, and then to plan out and work out a program, and just the minute they announced that they were ready to organize the steel workers, then the steel workers responded by the thousands—by the thousands. So, in the space of two or three months, I think the best conditions in the steel industry existed in South Chicago, Indiana Harbor and Gary, the best conditions existed there, and still, under the best conditions in the steel industry, the men responded when the opportunity presented itself.

Senator JONES. Now, Mr. Fitzpatrick, there is another point I would like to have you dwell upon a little further and clarify for the record. The condition of these men at the time of your interview with Mr. Gary, or rather your attempted interview with Mr. Gary, was radically worse at that time than it had been some time previous, wasn't it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. JONES. What I should like to have you explain more is what was the emergency that brought about this strike at the time it was inaugurated, and which would not permit it to wait upon the President's demand? What was the particular emergency? Was it in the condition of the men at the time, or what was it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Senator, the campaign of terrorism that was created in there, the murder of our organizers—there is the picture of Fannie Snellings, the woman organizer.

Senator JONES. But that was in a case, wasn't it, where a strike was already on?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, but that was part of the campaign of the intimidation and terrorism that they would not stop even at the killing of the woman organizers, and the killing of the men over in Indiana, arresting them, breaking up the meetings, and all of the tactics that they could resort to, threatening them with destroying the value of the stocks which they induced them to buy in the company, threatening them with ousting them if they lived on corporation property; threatening them with shutting off supplies from their grocerymen and starving them into submission; compelling them to either determine between the union or the company; oh you cannot begin to imagine the tactics resorted to by the underofficials of the steel company to intimidate the men, and it would be impossible.

Now, we made answer to the President of the United States as to why we could not comply with his request, and we gave eleven points to show the reasons. It was impossible, and I am sure that the President of the United States would not ask organized labor to do an impossible thing.

Senator STERLING. What was the date upon which these people were killed or injured, as you have described? When did that happen?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was during August.

Senator STERLING. During last August?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. During August.

Senator STERLING. And at the time a strike was on?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, no; the strike was not on then.

Senator WOLCOTT. A coal strike, I understood.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There was a coal strike up there.

Senator STERLING. Yes. Well, it was during that strike that the people were killed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; that is, that two of these people were killed.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They took advantage of that situation to kill Fannie Snellings, who was a field organizer and spoke at our steel meetings.

Senator STERLING. Do you pretend to say here that this lady was purposely killed by some one?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the evidence will show that conclusively.

Senator STERLING. Do you think that she was killed at the command or instigation of the steel officials, or any of them?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that the evidence will show that.

Senator STERLING. You think that they deliberately directed the killing of this woman, do you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator STERLING. You do think that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I believe that they brought about the killing of this woman for the purpose of putting fear in the hearts of the steel workers in that locality.

Senator STERLING. You think there was some meeting of some of the officials of the company at which that matter was considered and the killing of this woman was agreed upon?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, I do not think that they made a motion, Senator, and then took a record of the vote.

Senator STERLING. No, no.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And then published that in their monthly report. I do not believe that they did that, and I do not think that you think that they did it, either.

Senator STERLING. No, I do not; far from it. I want to know if you believe that the killing was at the instigation of some official of the steel company, and that the act has the sanction of the company. Do you dare say that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the killing of these four men—

Senator STERLING (interposing). I am asking you about that woman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am just telling about the killing of these four men. The president of the Association of Commerce of Chicago

made the declaration the day before that the way to treat labor is to use the slogan of the machine-gun corps, "Treat them rough," and the next day the gun men shot down these men. Do you think that that was deliberate or what was it?

Senator STERLING. Well, you have the proof, have you, that that was the statement made, that the way to treat them was to use the slogan of the machine-gun corps? You can prove that that statement was made?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes. And then the four men were killed.

Senator STERLING. Now, to recur for a moment to the eight-hour demand, I have not seen a copy of these terms before, but I see you have here as the third demand the eight-hour day. I would like to call your attention, so that it would go into the record, to a statement made by Mr. Welborn, of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., I think a few days ago, and put in the Congressional Record of yesterday, and I call your attention to it because I want to follow it up with a further question in regard to the eight-hour day. Mr. Welborn said:

The officers of the company met the representatives of the workmen, some 40 in number, Thursday night. The discussions at that meeting, and with the committee of five previously refferred to at another meeting held this morning, brought free acknowledgment by a considerable number of the representatives and by the committee that their working and living conditions under the operation of the industrial representative plan had greatly improved and was now much better than prevailed at eastern plants; that the treatment received at the hands of the company was fair, and that there had been no discrimination against men on the part of the company officials because of union activities. It was also unqualifiedly admitted that the eight-hour day, with one day's rest in seven, except where men requested otherwise, prevailed at this plant; also that no men were required to work 24-hour shifts. It was admitted, too, that wages paid here, so far as is known, are at least as high as those paid by eastern manufacturers.

Now, I understand also that the men of this company went on strike.

Mr. RUBIN. What company is that, Senator?

Senator STERLING. The Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. But to come to the point. You said a while ago that the men worked 12 hours a day, and then, in answer to a question of Senator Phipps, I think that you admitted that you did not know that they worked 12 hours a day continuously.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I said that the hours of labor in the steel industry were 12 hours. It is a 12-hour day. There may be shops where it is 8, and there may be shops where it is 10, but with the great bulk of the men in the steel mills it is a 12-hour day.

Senator STERLING. Let us be clear about that. Do the men work continuously during any one day 12 hours, or do they work in shifts, so that in the aggregate the work amounts to only 8 or 10 hours per day? And is not that the fact, rather than 12 continuous hours per day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, it is a drive, Senator.

Senator STERLING. Well, you can answer that question, I think, Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is on the two-shift basis. One bunch of men go to work and work 12 hours, and then the next crew comes on and they work 12 hours, and when they turn they have got to work 22 hours.

Senator STERLING. Does that bunch of men work continuously 12 hours without any intermission?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no question about that.

Mr. STERLING. Has there been a demand heretofore for less than 12 hours per day of work, prior to these 12 demands?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has there been a demand?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. And has not that demand been acceded to?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And a promise on the part of the company of an 8-hour day, which never materialized.

Senator STERLING. Have not you had a 10-hour day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Senator STERLING. Is the 12-hour day continuous work universal in the steel industry?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is not only a day, 12 hours a day. It is a 12-hour grind. It is come in in the morning and put your head in the halter and stay there until you put in 12 hours. It is the brutality, Senator, in this situation that makes these men rebel.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If you want any evidence, there is no better evidence than the conditions that you have now.

Senator STERLING. That is not the point.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the point.

Senator STERLING (continuing). That we are now considering. I want to know if men work continuously 12 hours out of 24 hours of the one day—that is the point—in the steel industry, and if that is universal in the steel industry to work 12 hours continuously out of 24?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I said that I had no information as to the actual operation in the plant, but it is common knowledge that the plants are operated on a 12-hour basis; that the men come in and work 12 hours continuously, and then their turn is done. Then another group come in and work 12 hours, and then the other shift comes back again.

The CHAIRMAN. If a man goes on at 6 o'clock in the morning—I think this is what Senator Sterling is getting at—does he work right straight through until 6 o'clock at night?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And has some time off at noon at lunch time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I suppose he has time to get a bite to eat, but he works 14 hours altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it 14 hours?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He would have to have about an hour to get out of bed and get his breakfast and get dressed and get to work. That takes an hour, and then he has got to put in his 12 hours a day, and then he has got to go home again and get his supper and go to bed.

The CHAIRMAN. Getting out of bed is work sometimes, but you do not generally call that work.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But it is included.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is 12 hours' work, is it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is 12 hours in the mill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And then, whether they do work or not, I say that it is a grind from the time that they get in there until they get out. They have their taskmasters and their stop watches.

The CHAIRMAN. They are under orders to work?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And efficiency experts, and the limitation of movements, and all of that kind of stuff. They have everything that the human mind can conceive of to drag an extra ounce of labor out of an individual.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Wolcott, have you any questions you want to ask Mr. Fitzpatrick?

Senator WOLCOTT. Yes, sir; just one or two. Mr. Fitzpatrick, comparing the steel workers with the railroad workers, in which group would you say there is the larger percentage of skilled labor?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, in the railroad.

Senator WOLCOTT. I have here in front of me a newspaper, which has been handed me, containing one little paragraph as to the testimony of the witness Doak before the Interstate Commerce Committee yesterday, when he made a comparative study of wages as between railroad workers and workers in other industries. This newspaper represents Mr. Doak as having said that railroad wages were not satisfactory. Trainmen's wages had increased 49 per cent since 1913, while those of steel workers had increased 111 per cent, meat-packing workers 115 per cent, and ship builders 160 per cent. Mr. Doak is vice president of the Trainmen's Brotherhood. Mr. Doak's figures were also put in the form of dollars per day, and as I recall it, cents per hour, and they are compared, according to my recollection, and show a very pronounced advantage in the matter of wage amongst the steel workers over and above railroad workers who are, as a rule, more skillful. If that be true, if the conditions may be described as pauperized conditions, is it not more strongly true among the railroad workers? Is there any escape from that conclusion?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the only thing you can prove by that statement, Senator, would be that the condition in the steel mills must have been awful when they started to compare them with the figures of another industry.

Senator WOLCOTT. No. What you can prove by that statement is, if the conditions in the steel mills are as you describe, the conditions in the railroad situation must be worse.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, no, I think it proves the reverse of that, because at that time the conditions in the steel mills must have been fearful. We, or at least I, understood that the percentage of increase of the wages of the steel industry was even higher than that.

Senator WOLCOTT. Higher than 111 per cent?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. But it is not a question of wages. The steel industry, of course, came up with the wages.

Senator WOLCOTT. I understand the hours of labor and conditions of labor, and so on, are more important to the steel workers than the money. I understand that.

Mr. RUBIN. That is a comparison as to the rates and not as to the original wages paid in each industry.

Senator WOLCOTT. As I say, my recollection is that the steel workers to-day are paid much more in dollars and cents than railroad workers, notwithstanding the fact, according to this witness, the rail-

road workers are more skillful. I may be in error as to my recollection of the figures.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fitzpatrick, if the other gentlemen are through, I want to ask you a question or two.

Senator JONES. I want to ask Mr. Fitzpatrick if the wages of these various mills at the different localities are the same, or do they vary with respect to the different mills and localities?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think that they vary very much, Senator.

Senator JONES. Does the living cost amount to about the same at each of these plants?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; I do not think there would be much difference in the living cost there. It would not materially change the situation.

Senator WOLCOTT. I understood you to say this morning that if it could be arranged that a conference should be held between the representatives of the steel concerns and the representatives of the men, the strike nevertheless would continue.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I said that we asked for a conference and were denied. The matter can not be adjusted without somebody getting their heads together. There is always hope in a conference. It will have to be settled by conference, and the sooner that is done the better.

Senator WOLCOTT. Well, I misunderstood you then.

The CHAIRMAN. I was going to ask him a question about that Senator.

Senator WOLCOTT. Go ahead, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to just record a few things as a résumé here, so we can be clear on them. When was this committee that you have spoken of that is directing this strike organized?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. August, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. August, 1918?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the national committee for organizing iron and steel workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was the first chairman of that committee?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. President Gompers.

The CHAIRMAN. And were you connected with that committee at that item, at the time of the organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I sat in with the other representatives when they met together for the purpose of forming the committee, and at the next meeting President Gompers asked me to preside because of his duties with war work.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you become chairman of the committee?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, as President Gompers went on with his war duties, he found it impossible to give any attention at all to the committee, and I acted as the acting chairman during all of that year, or up until the next june. At the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I do not think that those details are necessary, but just when did you become chairman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In June, at the Atlantic City convention.

The CHAIRMAN. Of this year?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Until then you were acting chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Mr. Foster's relationship to the strike? When did he become an officer in this committee?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He was selected secretary at the first meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the first meeting?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He has been secretary ever since, has he?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That was August, 1918?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Does he have any active part in the management of strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not any more than he is the secretary of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. But the word, what shall be done, is given by you, is it, and not by Mr. Foster?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. There is nobody that is handling this strike alone. This is 24 international unions cooperating together.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but there must be some head to it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are the heads. The 24 international unions compose this committee, and they meet and they decide all questions in connection with it.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are the chairman of the committee?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; but I have no authority to issue any orders or to take any action.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you end the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you call these 24 men into a committee meeting if a question was raised as to ending the strike and you would have to consult them as a committee?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Senator WALSH. They act as a board of directors?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Has Mr. Foster done anything, any lecturing or speaking to the different men, throughout that region of the country?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He has acted as an organizer.

The CHAIRMAN. As an organizer?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He went to meetings and addressed the meeting and helped them organize. You must also understand that those 24 international officers, of which he is one, has the responsibility of carrying on the work of their own particular organization in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I understand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The representative of the machinists has got to work with the machinists; the boiler makers' representatives has got to work with the boiler makers; the representatives of the blacksmiths has got to work with the blacksmiths; and Mr. Foster has got to work with the car men.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not countenance violence, as I understand it, in your strikes at all? You are against violence in your strikes at all. You are against violence and against the breaking of the laws?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely and teetotally. The men of this committee are citizens of the United States. They believe in the



laws. They uphold the laws. They have never violated the laws. They urge the men that they come in contact with to do the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Does Mr. Foster do that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now, Mr. Fitzpatrick, there is a good deal of talk in Congress about the doctrines of Mr. Foster as have been enunciated in a book he has written, which perhaps you are familiar with, "Syndicalism."

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have heard of it.

The CHAIRMAN. And Congressman Cooper, of Ohio, on the floor of the House day before yesterday, took up that doctrine of Mr. Foster. Have you read the book? Have you read the doctrines that he has to advance?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have looked through them; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you sympathize with some of those doctrines?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are things that are past and gone. They have had to go into the graveyard and search around there to get something. They have not got anything on Foster, except something that has been dead and buried so long that it has no more use; and that is where they went.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that those views as expressed by him which were put into the Congressional Record are not his present views?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely they are not his present views, and on the old adage that a wise man changes his mind and a fool never does, Foster is not that kind of a fellow. He has changed his mind.

Senator WALSH. When was the book published, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. This book was published a number of years ago, I am sure.

Mr. RUBIN. When he was in Seattle.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know when?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not recollect when, but I know it is a long time ago.

Mr. RUBIN. I think before 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, he said in that book:

The syndicalist is a radical antipatriot. He is a true internationalist, knowing no country. He opposed patriotism, because it creates feeling of nationalism among the workers of the various countries and prevents cooperation between them, and, also, because of the militarism it inevitably breeds.

Leaving out the last sentence, the first would be rather, it seems to me, an unpatriotic utterance; but you tell us now that he has changed his views upon these things?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, there is no doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. And is not pursuing anything of that kind now?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He is not preaching and is absolutely confining himself to the activities and scope of the American Federation of Labor, and has done so for the years that I have known him. This is not a new thing with me. I have known Foster for probably six or seven years.

Senator WALSH. What was his attitude toward this country during the war, if you know?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely loyal, and he did everything in his power to assist in every way. I worked with him. I worked with--

him during the whole of the war, and I know the service that he rendered to the country. I think that he rendered as great a service, not only to the United States Government, but to the Allies, as any man.

The CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever discussed this book with him at all?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, he joked about the views that he had in his younger days, when he associated with men who were actuated with radical thoughts, and he was imbued by it, but when he got his both feet on the ground and knew how to weigh matters with better discretion and more conscience, he had forgot all of those things that he learned when he was a boy, and is now doing a man's thinking in the situation.

Senator STERLING. Was this book published earlier than 1914?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, my, yes.

Senator STERLING. Do you know when it was published?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. 1914? I would say that the book was published about 1908 or 1909.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel, Mr. Fitzpatrick, that you and your associates did all you could to avoid a strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think that the Senator is going to question the situation as it presents itself when you know the men who are here and have rendered service to the Government all during this strike situation. We have here the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, an organization of course that was in the railroad and in the ship and in the other various industries, and the service that he rendered in having his men put forth the very best that they could—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You are speaking now of Mr. Foster, are you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; the Blacksmiths' International Union.

Senator WALSH. I do not think you got the Chairman's question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; but I am trying to give the committee some information as to the men who are associated together in this situation. You pick out Foster, and I wanted then to show you the men who are associated here. We have James Kline, the International President of the Brotherhood of Boilermakers. We have brother Franklin, who is the International President of the Brotherhood of Boilermakers. We have brother Valentine, of the Moulders; brother Moran, of the Bridge and Structural Iron Workers; Mr. McNulty, of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, but in his place is Mr. Noonan; the Machinists, Mr. Johnston; the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. Lewis, who is the acting President in charge; the Pattern Makers, Mr. Wilson, who has been across to different nations in handling the labor situation between this and other countries, and so have a number of these others here; brother Ryan, of the Railway Carmen of America.

Well, there are 24 of them of that type and caliber of men, and Mr. Foster was the Secretary and Mr. Gompers was the President during the first year of the campaign. At Atlantic City, in June, I was asked, or the international unions were asked to accept me as their chairman, and they did, and I have been acting in the capacity of chairman since.

Senator Walsh. Mr. Chairman, will you press your question now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Will you go back to my question. Do you feel that you and your associates have done all you honorably could in your power to avoid the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; absolutely and tetotally.

The CHAIRMAN. That answers it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that the letter to the President—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). That answers the question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK (continuing). Shows that we did all that we could, and then that it was impossible to not go into this strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that the Steel officials have done all they could to avoid the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that they have evaded their citizenship duty and their responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate the daily wage loss to the strikers? Can you give us any figures on that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. But I understand you to say the strikers—

Mr. FITZPATRICK (interposing). I do not think the amount that they are losing in wages worries them, Senator. The hope of a better day is more than all the money.

Senator WALSH. We are interested from the economical standpoint and would like to know the losses, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I was trying to get at.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not that information.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the strikers have been instructed to avoid violence. That is true, is it not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The why—I think you have given the reason why in your judgment these riots took place?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not due to the strikers, in your judgment?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have tried to show you where the officials themselves do not provoke and bring about these riots, that they do not happen.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I think we have seen in the press statements that guards and watchmen and loyal employees of the companies in some instances have been deputized and armed as officers. Do you know whether there is any truth in that statement?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question about that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have these mill guards and gunmen drilled; they are an army within the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Have any strikers been sworn in as sheriffs or marshals?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, but they have offered their services in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it from your testimony that you have given here that you feel that the authorities, to a certain extent, are unfriendly and nonsympathetic with the strike.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; and that they are used by the Steel Corporation to crush the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You are familiar with the National War Labor Board; its policies and so forth. It is not functioning now, but I presume you have seen the proclamation of the President and state-

ment giving the functions, powers, and duties of that board, have you not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the things is this: the right of workers to organize in trades unions and to bargain collectively through chosen representatives is recognized and affirmed, and this right shall not be denied, abridged or interfered with by the employers in any manner whatsoever.

That is one of the principles you are contending for, is it not?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The principle recognized by the War Labor Board, among its principles and policies?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, by a proclamation of the President.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that the Steel Corporation has interfered with that policy and is denying that right to the men?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They admit that they will not permit organization to exist; that they will not deal with it. If that is only the policy up above, that would be bad enough, but then I don't know how you are going to be able to get in your minds the situation that exists down below and the treatment that is accorded these men to carry out what petty officials think to be the policy of the company and what they do to make good in that situation—it is beyond the human mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this principle, as laid down by the War Labor Board, of the right to organize trade unions, recognized by the Steel Corporation during the war?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. They never have recognized that principle?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Not even during the war?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you put in the record the 12 demands that were to be made on Mr. Gary?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think I have them with me, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. They are given in the Record of yesterday. I will ask you to look at them and see if they are correct.

Senator JONES. They were in that letter.

Mr. RUBIN. No. Those were the eleven reasons why we could not delay the strike.

Senator WALSH. I notice you call them demands, Mr. Chairman. Some one used the expression 11 reasons why they could not delay the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not what I am speaking about, Senator.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You can call them demands or whatever you want to call them.

The CHAIRMAN. Call them what you please, but they were the 12 requests that you proposed to lay before Judge Gary?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are those correctly stated in the record which I hand you?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. 1. Right of collective bargaining. That is correct.

No. 2. Reinstatement of all men discharged for union activities, with pay for time lost. That is correct.

No. 3. The eight-hour day. That is correct.

No. 4. One day's rest in seven. That is correct.

No. 5. Abolition of 24-hour shifts. That is correct.

No. 6. Increase in wages sufficient to guarantee American standards of living. That is correct.

No. 7. Standard scales of wages for all crafts and classifications of workers. That is correct.

No. 8. Double rates of pay for all overtime work and for work on Sundays and holidays. That is correct.

No. 9. Check-off system of collecting union dues and assessments. That is correct.

No. 10. Principles of seniority to apply in maintaining, reducing, and increasing working forces. That is correct.

No. 11. Abolition of company union. That is correct.

No. 12. Abolition of physical examinations of applicants for employment. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Those 12 are correct?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by the "abolition of company unions"?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A short time ago you might have read in the paper of a group of steel employees going down to Atlantic City and having a meeting down there; they passed resolutions stating that the conditions in the steel mills were very satisfactory; that the wages were all that could be hoped for; and that there was absolutely no complaint upon which to justify any kind of grievance; and, therefore, that they were absolutely content with the conditions that existed. Then they adjourned, after adopting the resolutions, and came from Atlantic City and went into their slave holes in the steel mills.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you call a company union?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what they call a company union.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that the Midvale Steel Co. organization?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it was in connection with the Midvale Co.

Senator PHIPPS. That was not the Steel Corporation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what we call a company union—a group of men who will do a job like that under the dictation and direction of the steel officials.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are the 12 requests or demands, whichever you please to call them, that were to be laid before Judge Gary if you could have secured a conference?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, does that mean that if you did that and they did not grant every one of them, that you would go on strike, or were they merely the basis for discussion?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were the basis for discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. They were to be the basis of discussion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want you to get this point, Senator; that this conference committee that went to Judge Gary to ask him to meet with the representatives of his employees, was not the committee that was going to negotiate those points.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we understand that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to understand whether this means that if those twelve demands were not granted, there would have been a strike; or, might they have discussed them, granted some of them, and not granted others?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, absolutely. The point I wanted to make is this: There has a great deal been said about this committee being denied the conference. What this committee would have done would have been to ask Judge Gary to meet with the representatives of the employees for the purpose of discussing these things. He could have arranged in any way he wanted to. We would get the representatives of the men, and they would go in there—the men who were qualified to discuss and debate and argue about the different propositions—and he would have gotten his men, and if they had agreed then that they would wipe out the whole thing, that would have been satisfactory to us, if they had agreed to adopt the whole thing, it would have been satisfactory to us, or any portion of it.

The CHAIRMAN. This does not necessarily mean that if every one of those requests were not accepted that there would have been a strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, of course not.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if your requests had been accepted, would that mean that men who did not belong to unions in the steel mills would have been discharged?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. That men that did not belong to unions in the steel mills would have to have been discharged?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. It did not mean that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you one thing more. You recognize, do you not, that there is a third party to this strike, the public? Don't you think the public have some interest in these strikes? Don't you think that the great industries—the railroads and the steel mills—that there is really a third party that ought to be considered? Steel enters into every home, it enters into every line of business, into all of our industrial life.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir. We think there is only one representative of the disinterested party, and that person is the President of the United States. We went to the President of the United States, as a representative of the disinterested people, so that he might be given an opportunity to protect them and safeguard them. We laid our whole case in his hands, and the other side absolutely refused to give one hand about what the third party is going to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you would be glad, I am sure, as a humane man, to end this bloodshed and this loss of life that will go on in this strike, if it could be done?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say this morning that if Mr. Gary would submit to a conference now, that that would not end the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If he would consent to a conference?

The CHAIRMAN. If he would consent to a conference now, that it would not end the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Just agreeing to a conference?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would not put the men back in the mills, no.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not end the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, not at this particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. So much for that. If the Steel Corporation would agree to refer all difficulties to arbitration, would you be willing to do that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And end the strike?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you be willing to submit them to a board to be chosen by the President of the United States?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you are willing to end the strike in that way?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you say now if the steel people will do that, that you will call the strike off?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not the authority to call the strike off. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. But you feel that it could be called off?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My knowledge of the men who are handling the situation makes me believe that they would be glad to meet the situation in that way.

I just want to say this further, Senator, that when you mention the men who have been killed—the men have been killed, but the blood of those men is not on us; it is on the man who refused to do this. The other men who are going to be murdered in Pittsburgh to-night, to-morrow and the next day, the blood of those men is not going to be on us, but it is going to be on the head of the man who refused.

The CHAIRMAN. You are willing to do your part to stop any bloodshed from now on by submitting to arbitration?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, certainly.

Senator WALSH. Mr. Chairman, something has been said about Judge Gary appearing here. Do you mind giving the committee the information as to just what steps have been taken?

The CHAIRMAN. I gave that at the opening of the hearing, Senator. I wired Judge Gary at the same time that I wired Mr. Fitzpatrick, asking him to come here to-day. He called me on the 'phone and told me he could not possibly get here this week. We have arranged to hear him Wednesday of next week.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Fitzpatrick. Have you anything more that you would like to say to the committee?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If you will just pardon me just one minute. Senator, of course I have tried to give you the information in as detailed a form as I could. I wanted to show you the progressive steps of the entire situation, for all the years, from the beginning, and how the matter first developed, and down to the present situation.

I tried to show the situation that exists to-day in western Pennsylvania, and this condition that exists there exists only where the authorities provoked it, and where men are ridden down and beaten down, and where there is absolutely a denial of the citizenship rights; that they have been driven out of the halls, even the halls on the property that we bought. We bought two lots in McKeesport for the purpose of holding meetings; and we held meetings on the two lots, but we could not meet right there, on our own property. There is absolutely no right of free speech or free assemblage in many of these places now, except where the mill town officials permit it to go on.

Now, I do not want to take up any more of your time adding to that, but I say to you, Senators, that this is a very vital situation, a very serious situation; and that some arm of the Government must step in and prevent this thing that is going on down below.

Now, you may say to me that there may be lots of laws and rules in western Pennsylvania which the Government must observe, and consequently the Government can not take any cognizance of it. I say, in return, to you that it is important that the citizenship of the United States be protected by the United States Government when it is denied by States and the counties and by the municipalities; and, on behalf of the citizens of this country, who are guaranteed under the Constitution—whose guaranteed constitutional rights are being denied to them, I ask you, as a Senate committee, to take such action as will put these people in possession of their rights.

Senator WALSH. Was the reason given, Mr. Fitzpatrick, for the suppression of the public meetings, that there would be disorders following?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely not.

Senator WALSH. For illustration, the day of the policemen's strike in Boston, a United States Senator was not permitted to speak at a public hall, because of the conditions of disorder in Boston, and the authorities thought it was not wise for people to come together; and I would like to know whether this situation up there was caused by any disorder existing, or was the action taken by the Steel Corporation, or officials under their influence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That place was as quiet as a graveyard, only when the people were attacked by the officials of the town and the constabulary of the town.

Senator WALSH. You think that we ought at once to find out, so far as the peace of mind of the strikers is concerned, what their rights are to hold meetings?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; and, whatever that action is, that these men be secured in their citizenship rights, and that any action taken shall be taken quickly.

Mr. RUBIN. That is shown in those places where free assemblage and free speech were permitted, there was not any violence of any kind.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I only wanted to make this point. That national committee prepared a resolution. The national committee had a meeting yesterday in Pittsburgh and considered this very seriously and very carefully, considered the situation that existed there; and, while their work in dealing with the entire situation consumed all of the time up until I was ready to leave for Washington, the com-



mittee prepared a resolution, which was not prepared before I left, but the resolution was prepared dealing with this situation, and it is asking this branch of the Government, or this committee of the United States Senate, to take cognizance of this situation, and to see that the citizenship rights of the men of Pennsylvania be given to them.

Senator WOLCOTT. Have you any program as to how this committee can do that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; we are going to suggest it to you, and if you have not a program, we say find one.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it would be helpful for the committee to visit this strike region?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it would be a wonderful influence for the committee to go there, to get this idea, and to bring into your presence these men, with their heads beaten off of them, these women and children who have been trampled on, these homes that have been violated, because they drove their horses in there, and I think that this committee ought to take this cognizance of these things, and you are not going to have so much time to deal with the situation, Mr Senator. I tell you that I hold my citizenship second to no man; and I tell you that, as a citizen and a father, that this is a crisis in this Nation's history, and that unless the citizenship in Western Pennsylvania is immediately given their rights, God knows what is going to happen. I tell you that things are happening down there that in darkest Russia would not have been attempted—would not have been attempted.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. RUBIN. Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, will we have a right to cross-examine Mr. Gary when he comes here?

The CHAIRMAN. I think that that is up to the committee. I do not think that we will allow the matter to go on in that way permanently. The questions may be written out and handed to the committee.

Mr. RUBIN. May we know now whether this committee or a sub-committee will go to Pittsburgh, so that we can make preparations and have the witnesses ready and expedite this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is going to have an executive session now, and will consider that matter.

Mr. RUBIN. May I call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is a suit of the United States against the United States Steel Co. that has been pending in the Supreme Court of the United States since June 2, 1915, and that it has not been brought to a hearing.

Senator WOLCOTT. What have we got to do with that, Mr. Rubin? Can we do anything with that? As an attorney, you know that we can not.

Mr. RUBIN. I think that you might consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. I would suggest that you could speak to the Attorney General about it.

Mr. RUBIN. I think it ought to be a matter of record, anyhow, and should be considered by this committee.

Senator PHIPPS. I wish to state that the only information I have had about it recently was to the effect that the United States Steel

Corporation requested its consideration and that it be brought to a definite conclusion, and the Attorney General of the United States requested it to be postponed. That is where the matter rests at the present time, according to the best information I have.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear Mr. Gompers at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. It might be well for you to remain here, Mr. Fitzpatrick, until after the executive session of the committee.

The committee will now go into executive session.

(Thereupon, at 5.19 o'clock p. m., the hearing was adjourned until the following day, September 26, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

## INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate, pursuant to adjournment of yesterday, met at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 235, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon, presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Page, Sterling, Phipps, Smith of Georgia, Jones of New Mexico, McKellar, Wolcott, and Walsh.

Also present: Samuel Gompers, president American Federation of Labor;

William Roberts, assistant to Mr. Gompers;

John Fitzpatrick, president of Chicago Federation of Labor and organizer for the American Federation of Labor;

W. B. Rubin, counsel for the steel committee of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. We will ask Mr. Gompers to appear before us this morning and talk to us concerning this strike. We would like to have you at the head of the table, Mr. Gompers, if you do not mind. Mr. Gompers, will you take this seat? You may sit down or you may stand up, just as you wish; or you may sit down for awhile and then you may stand up for awhile.

Mr. GOMPERS. I will do anything but lay down.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Gompers, this committee would like to hear you very fully concerning this strike, the issues involved, the genesis of this strike, the reason why the strike was not postponed at the request of the President, your part in it, and all about it in your own way.

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir; that is a rather big job for a busy man, Mr. Chairman. If I may suggest, the subject should be divided into different parts, and should be brought out by questions. I do not think it would be difficult to lead me on to a discussion of the entire subject; but I have had no time, from other pressing duties, to get up anything like a chronological presentation of the matters covered by your question or suggestion or by the resolution of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you prefer questions, Mr. Gompers?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir; and if you will then permit me to have some such latitude as I ought, to reply, I shall be very much obliged to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose, then, we start with this. What are the issues involved in this strike?

Mr. GOMPERS. The issues involved in the iron and steel industry strike are varied. The right of the employees to be heard through their own representatives, through spokesmen of their own choosing; the right to have a voice in the determination of the conditions of employment, is of the most vital interest to them.

For many, many years, surely for the past 25 years, the right of association of the workers has been denied with all the power and wealth and domination of the Steel Corporation, not only through the exercise of lawful power, but directly, and more often indirectly, through denial by illegal and unwarrantable and brutal means.

The CHAIRMAN. Explain to us now what those means have been.

Mr. GOMPERS. It is—the terms generally employed now by the spokesmen for the steel corporations and employed largely through the press—that the men now engaged in the strikes throughout the country in the iron and steel industry are foreigners. That may be true to a very large extent and no doubt is true.

The CHAIRMAN. When you speak of “foreigners,” do you mean those who are not naturalized?

Mr. GOMPERS. I am speaking of men of foreign birth. I am not accurately informed as to how many of the employees are American citizens or what preparatory steps they may have taken for the purpose of securing American citizenship. I say that it may be, no doubt is, true that a large number—the largest number—of the employees of the steel corporations are foreigners, but it is equally true that those men were brought to the United States by the systematic efforts of these corporations who advertised for workmen of foreign birth. Foreign workmen were given preference in employment over American workmen and workmen in America who have attained American citizenship. A few years ago I undertook some investigation for the purpose of bringing to the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States evidence upon the subject of immigration. There were placed in my hands documents, originals and copies, which showed fully the combination and collusion of the corporations with the shipping companies, the German-American Shipping Co., the North German Lloyd Shipping Co., and the Hamburg American Shipping Co., the subsidizing of various agencies to bring workers from all parts of southern Europe and the Balkans into the United States. There was inaugurated a systematic, wholesale immigration from these countries into the United States. Anyone who had the opportunity of being at ports of entry into the United States could witness large gangs of men with small packs or large packs upon their backs being directed to the steel corporations of the United States.

There was a systematic effort to eliminate from these plants anything like a native or naturalized American. It is the harvest that they have been reaping when they stigmatize these workers as foreigners. They have upon their heads the guilt which I had the privilege of saying sometime ago would be upon them for the very methods they employed at the time.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have a bill up which we are very anxious to get out of the Banking and Currency

Committee, and that committee meets at half past ten, and I feel that it is incumbent upon me to attend that committee. Consequently, I will have to ask you to excuse me. I will say that if any vote is necessary you are authorized to cast my vote in my absence. I will come back just as soon as I possibly can, and hope to come back in a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Senator.

SENATOR PHIPPS. Will the witness kindly give the committee the approximate dates of the action which he refers to? At what time was this instance which you have mentioned—the bringing in of men for the purpose of employment?

Mr. GOMPERS. Oh, maybe from 25 years ago until just preceding the war.

Senator PHIPPS. Has that obtained since the passage of the act prohibiting the bringing in of men under agreement for employment, under contract, the contract-labor law?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And has any effort been made to stop that practice?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. By your organization or through other means?

Mr. GOMPERS. Particularly through other means and aided by us. There have been convictions under the provision of law and fines imposed.

Senator PHIPPS. And these printed statements to which you have referred, can you give us the date of them?

Mr. GOMPERS. Not now, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Of those printed documents you have?

Mr. GOMPERS. Not now, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You have them on file, have you?

Mr. GOMPERS. I can get you the dates as accurately as I can ascertain them from the records.

Senator STERLING. Can you give us the documents for the record here?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think I can, sir. I can not do it at this moment.

Senator STERLING. But will you later on? I think that we should have them.

Mr. GOMPERS. I will do the best I can. If any member of the committee or the committee itself will ask any questions, or if there is any question of documents or dates, and matters that I have before me, I shall be very glad to comply to the fullest extent of my ability.

Senator STERLING. I think it is very important, Mr. Chairman, that we should have them.

Senator JONES. And they should be submitted here for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Are those in such form that you can produce them for the record, produce the documents?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they very long documents?

Mr. GOMPERS. Some of them are, Mr. Chairman. I can not tell you exactly how long they are. Since that time I have had some things on my mind that did not have any bearing upon the subject. I am not always ready with the specific date or years; but, as I say,

I will hold myself subject to the requests of the committee for any further information or detailed information or specific information, as best I can.

Under the operation of the steel corporations, and particularly the United States Steel Corporation, the hours of labor were always abnormally long.

And not one of the corporations seemed to consider that they could operate unless they had their workers toiling 7 days each week, or 365 days a year. Men would be working day shifts for two weeks and then change the shift from day work to night work, and when this transition occurred from day work to night work, or from night work to day work, the hours of labor for that particular day were practically 24 hours.

Senator STERLING. You mean just at the time of the transition?

Mr. GOMPERS. At the time of the transition from night work to day work or from day work to night work, every two weeks.

Senator STERLING. That is, a man having worked day work on a change made would immediately go on night work?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That is what you mean by 24 hours?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Thereafter, after the transition, it would be 12 hours?

Mr. GOMPERS. For 13 days, and on the fourteenth day it would be a 24-hour day.

It is only within recent years that there has been anything like the observance of one day of rest in the iron and steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. Does that practice of a 24-hour day in alternate weeks still prevail in any of the steel mills, to your own knowledge?

Mr. GOMPERS. In many of them; in most of them. The right of association, the attempt to organize on the part of the working people themselves, has always met with stern opposition from the highest corporation authorities and from subordinates who carry out either the immediate direction or the understood policies of the companies.

I have not heard the testimony that has thus far been elicited before this committee, but I want to say this upon my own authority. Perhaps it may not have been presented to you: I refer to the requests which have come from the workers themselves to be organized, their appeals to us to organize them, to organize them secretly, but, in any event, to organize them. Many of the men, most of the men, who made any such effort were stopped by the detectives, by the espionage of the company agents or their detectives.

It has been elicited before committees of Congress that two years ago fully 8 per cent of the activities of detective agencies in the United States consisted in dealing with agents and detectives in the factories, shops, mills, mines, plants of employers, or in spying, watching, following, dogging men from their work to their homes, or to any place that they went; in supplying agents, or what is better known as agent provocateur to bring men into contests prematurely in order that they might commit some overt act, or that they might enter upon premature strikes for which they were unorganized and unprepared; in reporting men who had expressed some little discontent or great discontent with conditions in the plants or the mills. Men were dis-

charged for no other reason than because of their grumbling against conditions. Men who expressed the thought or the hope that they would like to be organized or who had the temerity to go to meetings in private homes or in public halls for the purpose of discussing the subject of organization were watched, tagged, and reported and the following morning would find themselves discharged.

The whole system was a greater espionage upon the workmen than was ever employed upon a man suspected of a great crime against the laws of our country or any of the States.

It was to put the fear of God into these men that if they organized or attempted to organize it would be at the peril of their employment. Being discharged from a plant of the steel industry meant practically the blacklisting of these men, and that they could not find any employment elsewhere.

Senator STERLING. You spoke of the right of association, of having been denied that right?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. By that term do you mean that they were denied the right to organize into unions?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes; or in any other way which had a tendency to have the workers unite themselves in any form that might have an influence upon the industry, upon their employment and upon the conditions of their employment. There are quite a number of men who have not only been watched, but the meeting places, the small halls rented for the purpose of meetings have been closed against the men. The proprietors of buildings in which halls are rented have been told that they must prevent meetings being held and must have the doors locked against the men.

We know of instances of men who wanted to go to a meeting place of an organization—and this is in recent times, too—men who going from their homes to the meeting places had to pass through two lines of detectives and thugs, run the gamut of a hundred or more on each side of them. Men who met in public meetings in lofts, privately owned, who had obtained permission to hold the meetings, have been run down, charged upon, and dispersed; some of them assaulted and some of them beaten.

Senator STERLING. Can you give instances of that, Mr. Gompers?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes. In McKeesport quite recently.

Senator STERLING. Before or since the strike at McKeesport?

Mr. GOMPERS. Since the strike—both before and after, and they met peaceably. I have been informed this morning, since I entered this hall, and my statement is capable of verification or refutation, that at McKeesport yesterday an order was given that no meetings can be held of the iron and steel workers in that city. The meeting halls hired for the purpose of consultation and discussion as to the situation have been closed against them. The offices of the unions of the iron and steel workers have been closed against all the men, against the officers of the local organization meeting there for the purpose of consultation as to what can be done in furtherance of the interests of the men engaged in this strike.

Senator STERLING. I suppose that was done, was it not, on the theory that a strike being on, the collecting of men in crowds would tend to bring about disorder and possibly violence and injury to persons and to property?

Mr. GOMPERS. I do not know the theory, but I know the fact, and I think I know the purpose; and the purpose is to keep the men, the officers of the organizations, from consulting in meeting for the purpose of furthering their interests in this controversy.

In the last statement I made I said that the offices rented by the organizations of the men, in order that the representatives of these men might meet, these offices for which the rent has been paid, have been closed. That is not meeting in public, but it is the right of domicile or the right peaceably and lawfully to conduct business.

The CHAIRMAN. Under whose orders were they closed?

Mr. GOMPERS. By the order of the mayor of McKeesport.

Senator STERLING. You would expect in such a time, in a town where there were so many of these workmen, when feeling runs high on both sides, that the authorities would be more on the alert in regard to the preservation of order and the prevention of violence, would you not?

Mr. GOMPERS. Alertness and maintaining order do not involve the invasion of private offices of probably the capacity of 10 or 12 people. The preservation of order by the authorities of McKeesport or of the Pittsburgh district does not contemplate the invasion of the offices of the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator WOLCOTT. As distinguished from that circumstance. I read in the morning paper a Pittsburgh dispatch as follows:

When told that State troops had broken up a peaceful meeting of strikers in a hall at Natrona, Sheriff Haddock said that the union men had the right to hold a meeting in any part of the county in a hall and would see that their rights were not invaded, the committee declared.

I just insert that in connection with your remarks regarding the McKeesport situation.

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator WOLCOTT. I do not, of course, know whether the information contained in the dispatch is correct or not.

Mr. GOMPERS. Assuming that the dispatch is correct, assuming that the statement read by Senator Wolcott is correct, it shows clearly what has been done to call forth such a rejoinder. If the meetings in rooms, privately rented and privately occupied, had not been invaded, such a rejoinder or such assurance now would not be necessary.

I have no hesitancy in saying that the first duties of the authorities of a municipality, as of any other portion of our country, is to maintain order. There is no question about that; but in the maintenance of order the rights, the guaranteed constitutional rights of the citizens, must not be invaded. The right of public assemblage is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; the right of free speech is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and the right of free press is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and only in the event of war and when martial law shall obtain, may these rights be suspended, and then only for the preservation of the Republic of the United States and not in furtherance of the private interests of a private profiteering corporation.

Without particularizing or making a general accusation, I know that to a very large degree the public authorities of very many of the districts in Pennsylvania are under the direct domination of the United States Steel Corporation. Their whole conduct clearly dem-



onstrates that. Whatever furthers the interest of the corporation as against the workers is done by the authorities in nearly all of the districts of Pennsylvania.

Here and there there has been, in past years, a demonstration of resentment, of industrial revolt, if you please, against the great injury and wrong inflicted upon the working people.

The corporation has declared that it runs, and proposes to run, its establishment under the misnomer of an open shop. As a matter of fact the shop, in so far as the corporation itself, the superintendents, and foremen are concerned, in so far as it is possible for them, with all their power to see to it, has been a closed shop, closed to the unions, closed to union men, and when the men have organized at all it has been against every machination of the corporation and its spokesmen.

Senator McKELLAR. Would you give us just the reasons why this strike was called; the grounds on which it was called, so that we can have them clearly before us; if you will just take them up in order, one after the other, and then discuss them.

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes; I shall be very glad to do that to the best of my ability.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, you do it very well.

Mr. GOMPERS. What I have tried to do thus far has been to show the causes which have made their impressions upon the minds of the men, and which have been the feeling of consciousness or subconsciousness of wrong and injustice.

Senator STERLING. Before you leave the point to which you referred a moment ago, what proportion of the workers in the steel mills of Pennsylvania are organized?

Mr. GOMPERS. I can not tell you that of Pennsylvania. I can tell you it in a general way. I will come to that question in a moment, if I may, Senator.

Senator STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. GOMPERS. In response to the many requests to organize and to have us aid these workers in organizing, some years ago we sent a few organizers into the field. Those men were arrested and driven out of town. One of them was so bludgeoned that within a few months afterwards he died. He was one of the best, most intelligent and constructive workers and organizers in our service.

Senator STERLING. Was there any strike on at that time?

Mr. GOMPERS. No, sir. I refer to the late Mr. Jefferson Davis Pierce, of Worcester, Mass.

Senator STERLING. When was that?

Mr. GOMPERS. About four or five years ago. In view of the applications, made to us, we undertook a campaign of organization. We had about eight or ten of our men go among the iron and steel workers. We sent some documents printed in 22 or 23 different languages among the people calling them to meetings. The effort was abortive by reason of the tactics employed by the corporation and their representatives that I have indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have to send notices in that many different languages?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-two or twenty-three?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir. I think I can furnish a copy of one or two of these documents, so that you may see the polygot of it.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would do that. Did you send one printed in each of the 22 languages?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir. There were 22 languages on the one sheet.

The CHAIRMAN. On the one sheet?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have that.

Mr. GOMPERS. Very well. I think we have one or two on file. We have been trying to be helpful to these men for a long time, and our efforts have never entirely ceased.

At the convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at St. Paul, in June, 1918, a resolution or a motion was adopted, by which the officers of the various trade unions in the iron and steel industry and its various branches were called to meet during the convention. As president of the American Federation of Labor, I was named as one of those who were requested to participate in that conference, and I was present. I was elected chairman of the conference. The committee, or rather the conference, decided to form itself into an organizing committee of the workers in the iron and steel industry. Instead of making the movement as it had theretofore been conducted, the endeavor to bring the workers into one big organization in any district, the policy was outlined to organize the workers into the various unions of their respective branches, trades or crafts, and that there should be this organizing committee, and the officers of these national trade unions, to be a sort of federation of the organizations of the iron and steel workers.

While I was chairman, I could not give the work of the organizing committee the full attention that the position required. I was rather active in the other affairs of the toilers and the people of our country, and in addition to that I was rather busily engaged in trying to help the Government of the United States and our allied countries to win the war. I went to Europe three times within the past 13 months; I was upon all the battle fronts, and in association and conference with men of labor and men of other affairs and walks of life in Europe. I traveled more than 18,000 miles on the ocean within about a year. Therefore, I have not been able to give the work of organizing and coordinating the movement the attention which that position required.

As a consequence, at the convention of the American Federation of Labor held at Atlantic City, in June, 1919, I asked that I should be relieved from the position of chairman of the committee. I was excused, and Mr. John Fitzpatrick was elected as the chairman of that committee. Now, I think a fairly well-defined plan was adopted by which the work of organizing and the expenses involved would be provided by the organizations of the trades already in existence and by a small contribution from those whom it was sought to be organized and made members of the union.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Gompers, at that point, it has been stated that in the steel industry the great majority of employees are unskilled. Did this effort for organization include the unskilled workers of the steel industry?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And that would embrace the common day laborer, would it?

Mr. GOMPERS. It would. It would include all workers employed in the iron and steel industry who had not already been organized. There are 24 national trade-unions having jurisdiction over the classes of employment, or the classes of work, rather, and of the men performing it. That class of workers for which there is no national trade-union would become directly affiliated to the American Federation of Labor.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Mr. Gompers, you have expressed your opinion that while the steel corporations, that is, not only the United States Steel Corporation, but the others as well, declare that they desire to operate on an open-shop basis, their real attitude is that of limiting employment to men who will not or do not belong to unions. What is the attitude of the American Federation of Labor as regards the employment of nonunion men in shops where you have organized the employees? Is there any objection made by the federation to the employment of nonunion men?

Mr. GOMPERS. The American Federation of Labor has nothing to do with the subject at all. That is a matter for the national trade unions to outline their policies.

Senator PHIPPS. What has been the policy as outlined by the national trade-unions?

Mr. GOMPERS. The national trade-union's effort has been to try to organize the workers.

Senator PHIPPS. And to exclude the employment of nonunion men whenever possible?

Mr. GOMPERS. To organize the workers, to try to have the workers organized in a plant 100 per cent.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Gompers, you are familiar with the operations or with the conduct of the business organization of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers some 20 years ago, say?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What was their attitude at that time on this point?

Mr. GOMPERS. At that time the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers was composed exclusively of the skilled workmen in the trade.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes, and was it their attitude that unless a man joined the union he should be displaced in his position?

Mr. GOMPERS. The position was that of agreement between the company and the union for wages and conditions of employment, to be paid to members of the Amalgamated Association, which in effect would not exclude any nonunion men, but when he came to work he would become a member of the organization.

Senator PHIPPS. What were the working conditions of men who declined to join the union?

Mr. GOMPERS. I do not know such an animal. Not in all the years of my experience have I come across a workman who voluntarily declined to become a member of the union of his trade.

Senator PHIPPS. My own experience has been rather different, but that is immaterial.

Mr. GOMPERS. I suppose that the men would come to you, privately, Senator Phipps, who would not come to me and present the same point of view.

Senator PHIPPS. I think so.

Mr. GOMPERS. And probably, if I may presume so much as to say that I think they would be more frank with me than they would be with you as to their employer.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, I was not always an employer. I have been an employee and hand in glove with the workmen themselves.

Mr. GOMPERS. Your position in life would at least, I think, and my position in life, would prompt them to be more frank and open with me than they would be with you.

Senator PHIPPS. I am not speaking of the present time, but I am speaking of 20 years ago.

Mr. GOMPERS. Even 20 years ago—I had the pleasure of your acquaintance then, I think——

Senator PHIPPS. Yes, perhaps, before when I was a shipping clerk or filled some other similar position at that time. Now, Mr. Gompers, it has been mooted that a strike is to be called in the plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co. There is an organization of the American Federation of Labor in that plant, is there?

Mr. GOMPERS. There is.

Senator PHIPPS. In deciding whether or not——

Mr. GOMPERS (interposing). Pardon me, I want to correct my answer. There are organizations of workers belonging to national trade unions, which trade unions are affiliated to the American Federation of Labor.

Senator PHIPPS. I think that has been very clearly stated. Now, in determining whether or not a strike shall be called at that plant, can you tell this committee just what the method of procedure will be?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think that if such a strike is contemplated, the committee will approach the employers, representatives of the company or corporation, and ask for an opportunity to present the causes which the men believe should receive the consideration and attention of the company, and ask for a conference for the purpose of discussing them and endeavoring to reach an adjustment.

Senator PHIPPS. Will that conference be requested by men who are actual employes in the plant itself, or will they be represented by officials of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. GOMPERS. The likelihood would be that they would be the representatives of the men, chosen by themselves without regard to whether they are employed by the corporation or not, exercising exactly the same right that the corporation exercises in calling a lawyer or any other expert as their defender to advocate the cause of the corporation in any eventuality.

Senator PHIPPS. Along the same lines as was done in the request for a conference with the head of the Steel Corporation before the present strike was called?

Mr. GOMPERS. Approximately. May I say, Senator, that during the time of the convention of the American Federation of Labor at Atlantic City, last June, I took occasion to write a letter to Judge Gary, I think couched in respectful language. I asked that he might accord a committee an opportunity to meet him for the purpose of discussing the situation. I think that in that letter I said that perhaps if the privilege was accorded, I might have the time or the opportunity to be with the committee should they meet with the judge. I can furnish the committee with a copy of that letter, I think.

Senator PHIPPS. That is possibly the letter that has already been inserted in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. No, I think not.

Mr. GOMPERS. It is my letter to Mr. Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you insert the answer, too, Mr. Gompers?

Mr. GOMPERS. I would if I could, but the letter was unanswered and unacknowledged. The courtesy of an answer or acknowledgment was not given.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether Judge Gary ever received the letter?

Mr. GOMPERS. I do not know of my own knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. The mails are a little slow, you know.

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, but that was last June and this is September 26. It is over three months, and I have faith in Uncle Sam. It was sent in an envelope, an official envelope of the American Federation of Labor, containing the return address both on the envelope and on the letter head.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Gompers, I hold in my hand what purports to be a copy of a letter addressed by the chairman of the United States Steel Corporation, I believe under date of September 16, reprinted in the Daily Bulletin issued by the Manufacturers Record under date of September 19.

Mr. GOMPERS. 1919?

Senator PHIPPS. 1919. I have seen another copy of this letter, bearing the date of September 16 and have compared it with this, and I know that they are identical. I will read this letter:

Not long since I respectfully declined to meet, for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to labor at our various plants, a number of gentlemen representing certain labor unions. They claim this furnishes cause for complaint and have stated that they intend, if possible, to prevent a continuance of operations at our mills and factories.

I deem it proper to repeat in a letter what heretofore has been said to you verbally. I entertain no feeling or animosity toward the gentlemen personally and would not hesitate to meet them as individuals, but I did not consider it proper to confer with them under the circumstances.

The declaration was made for two reasons: First, because I did not believe the gentlemen were authorized to speak for large numbers of our employees, whose interests and wishes are of prime importance. Secondly, because a conference with these men would have been treated by them as a recognition of the "closed-shop" method of employment. We do not combat labor unions as such. We do not negotiate with labor unions, because it would indicate the closing of our shops against nonunion labor; and large numbers of our workmen are not members of unions and do not care to be.

The principle of "open shop" is vital to the greatest industrial progress and prosperity. It is of equal benefit to employer and employee. It means that every man may engage in any line of employment that he selects, and under such terms as he and the employer may agree upon; that he may arrange for the kind and character of work which he believes will bring to him the largest compensation and the most satisfactory conditions, depending upon his own merit and disposition.

The "closed" means that no man can obtain employment in that shop except through and upon the terms and conditions imposed by the labor unions. He is compelled to join the union and to submit to the dictation of its leader before he can enter the place of business. If he joins the union, he is then restricted, by its leader as to place of work, hours of work (and therefore amount of compensation) and advancement in position, regardless of merit, and sometimes, by the dictum of the union leader, called out and prevented from work for days or weeks, although he has no real grievance, and he and his family are suffering for the want of necessities of life. In short, he is sub-

jected to the arbitrary direction of the leader, and his personal independence is gone. Personal ambition to succeed and prosper is stifled.

This country will not stand for the "closed shop." It can not afford it. In the light of experience we know it would signify decreased production, increased cost of living, and initiative, development, and enterprise dwarfed. It would be the beginning of industrial decay and an injustice to the workmen themselves, who prosper only when industry succeeds. The "open shop" generally will be approved by them, for this permits them to engage in any employment, whether they are or are not members of a labor union.

It is appropriate, further, to emphasize what has been said many times in regard to our employees. Everyone, without exception, must be treated by all others justly and according to merit. In accordance with our established custom, one of our workmen, or a number of our workmen from any department, will continue to be received by the management to consider for adjustment any question presented.

It is the settled determination of the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries that the wages and working conditions of their employees shall compare favorably with the highest standards of propriety and justice. Misrepresentations have already been made and hereafter will be made; unfavorable criticisms may be indulged in by outsiders, especially by those who have little knowledge of the facts; our employees may be threatened and abused in the effort to influence them to join the union against their own desires; but, whatever the circumstances may be, we should proceed with the conduct of our business in the usual way and should give evidence to our employees that we mean to be fair with them.

That closes the letter, and, incidentally, there is published on the same page two other quotations, and I would like to read them:

I am a fierce partisan of the open shop and of everything that makes for individual liberty—

The CHAIRMAN. And whose quotation is this, Judge Gary's?

Senator PHIPPS. That was not. This is President Woodrow Wilson, then signed as Dr. Woodrow Wilson, under date of January 12, 1909.

I will read further:

I am a fierce partisan of the open shop and of everything that makes for individual liberty, and I should like to contribute anything that might be possible for me to contribute to the clarification of thinking and the formation of right purposes in matters of this kind.

Extract from letter of Dr. Woodrow Wilson, January 12, 1909, in reply to an invitation to speak at a banquet of antistrike and anti-boycott advocates.

Senator PHIPPS. Which is under the date of 1909, without the exact date being given, is also from President Wilson.

Mr. GOMPERS. Not President Wilson.

Senator PHIPPS. This is in 1909 and was then Dr. Wilson.

Mr. GOMPERS. It is not President Wilson.

Senator PHIPPS (reading):

You know what the usual standard of the employee is in our day. It is to give as little as he may for his wages. Labor is standardized by the trades unions, and this is the standard to which it is made to conform. No one is suffered to do more than the average workman can do; in some trades and handicrafts no one is suffered to do more than the least skillful of his fellows can do within the hours allotted to a day's labor, and no one may work out of hours at all or volunteer anything beyond the minimum.

I need not point out how economically disastrous such a regulation of labor is. It is so unprofitable to the employer that in some trades it will presently not be worth his while to attempt anything at all. He had better stop altogether than operate at an inevitable and irreparable loss.

The labor of America is rapidly becoming unprofitable under its present regulation by those who have determined to reduce it to a minimum.

Our economic supremacy may be lost because the country grows more and more full of unprofitable servants.

Extracts from baccalaureate address of President Woodrow Wilson before the graduating class of Princeton University in 1909.

Mr. GOMPERS. And under the title of "Unprofitable servants."

Senator PHIPPS. The title is not given.

Mr. GOMPERS. I am furnishing it.

The CHAIRMAN. May I inquire if this is published in book form, or what is it?

Mr. GOMPERS. No; it is not published in book form.

Senator PHIPPS. There is another which I would like to read.

Mr. GOMPERS. Before you read that, is that from the same authority?

Senator PHIPPS. The same authority. (Reading:)

We speak too exclusively of the capitalistic class. There is another, as formidable an enemy to equality and betterment of opportunity as it is, and that is the class formed by the labor organizations and leaders of the country.

Extract from address by Dr. Woodrow Wilson at a dinner at the Waldorf Hotel, March 18, 1918.

Senator PHIPPS. I read these for the purpose of giving the witness an opportunity to express his views upon the points raised.

Mr. GOMPERS. May I make some observation upon that which you have presented to us?

Senator PHIPPS. Certainly. That is the purpose of it. I desire first to ask you one question, which I think is pointed, and that is, of your own knowledge, are you aware of any refusal on the part of any superintendent of the Steel Corporation or of any other steel company at any time to receive a complaint presented by a committee of its own employees?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think it would be wholly out of order of the matter which you presented for me to answer that question at this time. If you will permit me to make some observations upon the letter, or upon the quotations made by Dr. Woodrow Wilson, I think it would be a little more patent and clear, and I shall answer your question, if I may, after I have made those observations.

Senator PHIPPS. Certainly.

Mr. GOMPERS. I think it is as unfair to quote statements made by Dr. Woodrow Wilson of 1907 and 1909 and compare them and quote them as his judgment of to-day, as it is to hold Mr. Foster, secretary of the organized committee of the iron and steel workers, for his utterances of 10 and 12 years ago, and hold him responsible for them to-day, when he has disavowed them and frankly acknowledged that he was wholly in error in his point of view at that time.

That is all the observations that I care to make upon the statements read here, by Dr. Woodrow Wilson, and holding that as the expression of President Woodrow Wilson in 1919.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any reason to believe that President Wilson holds views other than those expressed by him in 1907 and 1909 on this topic?

Mr. GOMPERS. The whole course of the President of the United States, Hon. Woodrow Wilson, in regard to labor matters, to the relations of workers to employees, to the organizations of labor, and his efforts to help to compose whatever differences existed, is in

itself a sufficient answer, but let me supplement that by this—that before the war, before the United States entered into the war, he, as President of the United States, appointed the president of the American Federation of Labor as one of the advisory committee of the Council of National Defense. As President of the United States he appointed a committee of citizens, called the War Labor Conference Board, composed of five business men, organized business men, and five representatives of organized labor to meet in conference to outline policies for the adjustment of differences between employers and workers. The declarations of the conference board, with former President Taft as one of the joint chairmen and Mr. Frank P. Walsh as the other joint chairman—the declarations of that War Labor Conference Board declared for these principles. I am quoting to you from memory:

The right of collective bargaining between workers and employers.

The right of representatives of workers to be heard in any matter in controversy.

The standard eight-hour work day.

The right of a living wage for workers, conforming to the American standards of living.

The CHAIRMAN. The right to organize into labor and to trade-unions?

Mr. GOMPERS. The right to organize into trade-unions, yes, sir; and collective bargaining, and others which my memory does not now serve me. That War Labor Conference Board declarations were approved by the President of the United States, Mr. Woodrow Wilson. The personnel which constituted the War Labor Conference Board was the personnel of the War Labor Board created by the War Labor Conference Board and approved by the President of the United States, Mr. Woodrow Wilson.

At the dedication of the building of the American Federation of Labor in Washington the President of the United States, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, made the dedicatory address. I commend that address to your serious attention, Senator.

At the convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Buffalo in November, 1917, the President of the United States, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, came to that convention and delivered an address to the delegates and visitors in attendance at that convention. I commend that address to your very serious consideration.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe that I have read both of them.

Mr. GOMPERS. Pardon me, if you please. You asked me whether I had reason to believe that the President had changed his mind.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; I did.

Mr. GOMPERS. When there was a dispute between the railroad brotherhoods and the railroad companies regarding the eight-hour work day, President Wilson appointed a committee of four, consisting of Secretary Lane, Secretary Wilson, Mr. Daniel Willard, and the president of the American Federation of Labor, authorizing them and directing them to make every honorable effort for the composition of the differences between the railroads and brotherhoods, and that was done.

In the matters arising in the various and numerous activities of labor I have found that the President of the United States, Mr.



Woodrow Wilson, has given every honorable, lawful effort that he could in endeavoring to bring about some reasonable understanding and agreement between the representatives of employers or the employers themselves and the workers.

And in the recent invitation which the President of the United States has extended to the employers of labor and to the organizations of labor, to be represented at a conference called by him, to take place on October 6, 1919, about two weeks from now—less than two weeks from now—is evidence to me that the President would not now adhere to the declarations that he made in 1907 and 1909.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gompers, do you really think that, as far as this question that is before us is concerned, the question of whether the President has changed his mind or not is of any particular importance?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think not, but I have been questioned upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that we had better get down to brass tacks now?

Mr. GOMPERS. I do, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You, up to the time or before the time that Mr. Fitzpatrick preceded you—

Senator PHIPPS (interrupting). Pardon me one moment, Mr. Chairman. These statements were published, and I believe that this witness is qualified to express his opinion upon these statements. I am giving him that opportunity, without any question of being unfair whatsoever, and this committee can see fit to be its duty to bring out all the facts which are of importance.

Mr. GOMPERS. And I will say that I am perfectly willing to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you or have you not fully answered it?

Mr. GOMPERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation or two upon the letter which Mr. Gary has sent to his subsidiary companies and upon which Senator Phipps has questioned me.

Senator MCKELLAR. Has the witness answered fully Senator Phipps' question in reference to the President and his views. I think you ought to have an opportunity to answer those questions as fully as you desire.

Mr. GOMPERS. I have answered the question of Senator Phipps upon the President's attitude or whether I believed he had changed his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. I certainly was not trying to stop the discussion in any way, but I think we had better get down to brass tacks on the matter before us.

Mr. GOMPERS. As Senator Phipps has read a letter of Judge Gary, I would like to have an opportunity to make an observation or two upon that letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. GOMPERS. In my letter and the several letters addressed to Judge Gary by the committee, there was not the remotest reference to any question of closed shop or open shop. I assert, without any hesitation or fear of contradiction, that it was not in the minds of the committee and I know it was not in the mind of myself, to discuss the question of the open and closed shop if such conference were had. It has been simply—if I may use the vulgarism—lugged in by the

judge in that letter that is read and in the publicity of the corporation that this controversy—

The CHAIRMAN (interrupting). Then you say that the closed shop is not an issue in this strike?

Mr. GOMPERS. It is not an issue, sir. You can imagine one of the common laborers, unskilled laborers, or skilled workers, if you please, as an individual, going to Judge Gary and presenting a grievance; or, even if not to Judge Gary, to the corporation's counsel, appointed by Judge Gary. You can imagine what chance of presentation would be afforded such poor devil by the representative of this billions and millions of dollars corporation. You can imagine how much courage a man would have in appearing before Judge Gary, or one of his representatives, to present either an individual grievance or a general grievance which the workers may have.

Senator STERLING. Now, I think that Senator Phipps asked a question awhile ago that if you have ever known of Judge Gary turning down a committee of workers in the mills—

Senator PHIPPS. No; the question was if any superintendent or foreman of the steel corporation or any other steel plant—

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. GOMPERS. That is very much like the answer that I made to the Chairman when he asked me to put into the record the answer of Judge Gary to my letter. Men of labor should know and whoever had experience does know, as I know, after an experience of 26 years as a factory worker, working at my trade, I have had many years' experience since I have not worked as a wage earner in a factory, and I know the experiences of other workers who have attempted to meet employers, particularly of large corporations. Yes, in a small concern where the employer knows each worker, that may be, but in a corporation, where the superintendent or president knows not one out of one hundred thousand, surely there is no necessity for this assumption of virtue on the part of Judge Gary that he would not have a committee or individual turned down. The individual would not have the temerity to try to be heard and have consideration given to any grievance which he or his brothers may have.

Senator STERLING. You spoke of the individual, however.

Mr. GOMPERS. Or the committee.

Senator STERLING. Or the committee. Suppose there is a committee appointed by the workers to interview a superintendent or Mr. Gary himself, you say now that that committee would be invariably turned down and denied opportunity for conference with that superintendent?

Mr. GOMPERS. I say there is no such possibility of the workers meeting for the purpose of discussing their grievances and selecting a committee to represent them.

Senator STERLING. That is a little different question. That does not answer my question. Do you mean to say now that the workers have no opportunity of consulting together with reference to the appointment of a committee to interview a superintendent?

Mr. GOMPERS. Senator, I mean to say this, that the selection of a committee is only the second step in such a procedure. The first must be not only the feeling that the grievance exists, but the opportunity of the men to meet for the purpose of discussing those grievances and

authorizing a committee, selecting a committee and authorizing it to speak on the matter for the workers and for the presentation of those grievances. I say, sir, that there is no opportunity for the workers now to discuss their real grievances with such an object in view.

Senator STERLING. Can you give instances here now? I do not mean during the period of a strike, when the authorities must be on the alert to quell disturbances or something of that kind; but in peaceful times, when there is no strike, can you cite instances where meetings have been prohibited?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Where workers could not meet and discuss their grievances and appoint committees?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir; yes, sir; time without number.

Senator STERLING. Will you give us special instances, if you can?

Mr. GOMPERS. I can not give them from memory—just a moment. I can submit to you copy of a resolution adopted by the convention of the American Federation of Labor last June, and the remarks made upon that resolution by Mr. Fitzpatrick, then newly elected chairman of the organizing committee. and alway, though vice chairman, the active man in the work.

Whereas, the mayors of several towns in the Pittsburgh district have arbitrarily suppressed the rights of free speech and free assembly, and have refused to permit the American Federation of Labor to hold meetings in their towns; and,

Whereas, every effort has failed to dissuade them from this un-American and autocratic attitude, they refusing absolutely to be guided by policies of justice, reason, and fair play. Therefore, be it—

Senator STERLING. Before you go any further, tell me what time this was?

Mr. GOMPERS. Just before the Atlantic City convention in June of 1919.

now *resolved*, that the thirty-ninth convention of the American Federation of Labor heartily condemns this lawless conduct; and, be it further

*Resolved*, that we respectfully request the President of the United States to institute a congressional investigation of the situation in western Pennsylvania, and to take such steps as he may deem necessary to put the Constitution into force in this district.

Mr. John Fitzpatrick made a speech to the convention in which he pointed out where these meetings had been stopped, and this is what he said:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FRIENDS: The resolution which is printed in the minutes deals with the question of free speech, and we feel it is one of the most important resolutions that has come to the convention. The "resolve" in the resolution asks that the executive council of the American Federation of Labor proceed to have instituted a congressional or other investigation of the denial of citizenship rights in western Pennsylvania. In order to understand this situation it might be well to take a moment of your time in connection with the formation of the work of the national committee for organizing iron and steel workers.

The St. Paul Convention of the American Federation of Labor authorized President Gompers to call a conference for the purpose of bringing together the international representatives to discuss and decide upon a method of procedure.

Twenty-four international unions were represented by their presidents or special representatives, and the national committee was formed.

President Gompers was elected chairman, and W. Z. Foster, of the carmen, was elected secretary. We felt they would be able to develop a general or-

ganization campaign throughout the country as far as the iron and steel industry was concerned, but, unfortunately, because of the resources at our command and the number of men we had we were compelled to confine our activities to the Chicago district.

In a short time we were able to organize Gary, Ind., Joliet, Ill., South Chicago, Indiana Harbor, East Chicago, and various other points where large steel industries existed. But a short time prior to that campaign it had seemed impossible that labor could make itself felt at these points. By October we had sufficient organization to enable us to take our men out of that district.

The Steel Corporations felt they would deal us a deadly blow at that particular time. They had declared that the steel industry would not be organized, but they saw our campaign had some punch in it and was making itself felt, so the steel corporations conceded about the only thing they could concede to the workers at that time—the eight-hour day—but it was handed out as a kind of sop to prevent the workers from being interested in the organization. In spite of that our committee was able to go in and increase our membership and get more thorough organization in the various departments and plants.

About the time the steel trust endeavored to deliver this blow to labor we were in a position to move our working force into the heart of the steel district in Pennsylvania. That was our answer to the steel trust, and we put ourselves on the map in western Pennsylvania.

We opened up headquarters at Pittsburgh; then, of course, we came in contact with the more scurrilous activities of the representatives of the steel corporation. It would take too long to describe the tactics adopted to harrass our meetings and prevent us from exercising our common, every-day citizenship rights.

We had meetings in Pittsburgh, where the men had to go through a line of 200 thugs, plug-uglies, and blacklegs employed by the steel trust for the purpose of terrorizing and browbeating the men in the steel industry. In spite of that we went on with our work.

At Homestead there was a small strike of the machinists. We went into Homestead and held the first open mass meeting that had been held in that city in 27 years. After that meeting was held other arrangements we had made to organize there were stopped; halls we had rented were denied us; the owners who had accepted our money for rent of the halls had to return it, and when they could not use excuses of that kind the health departments at these various towns were used to prevent the committee from holding meetings.

We went to a place called Monessen and rented a hall. The money was returned and we were given to understand that meetings could not be held in that town. Across the river from Monessen is a little town called Charleroi, where a number of miners had their organization. When the miners held their eight-hour-day celebration on the 1st of April they went over the river to Monessen and held their meeting. They gave us an opportunity, by assembling there, to hold our meeting.

A town near by was so under the influence of the steel combination that not only were the employees of the Steel Trust intimidated, but they undertook to use their influence to intimidate the business men. The business men were forced to sign a petition asking the working men not to join the organization, and to declare that their conditions in those slave pens were satisfactory to them.

Finally this activity became so acute we were compelled to call a meeting in Pittsburgh; more than 400 organizations sent delegates to that convention, and all the labor unions in the vicinity of Pittsburgh were represented. This convention was a declaration on the part of the organizations in that locality that they were going to have their citizenship rights respected, and they would not brook further interference on the part of the Steel Trust. That had a very good effect, and for some time the active opposition of the Steel Trust was not so pronounced.

In McKeesport we arranged meetings, and met with the same kind of opposition. We were denied the right to meet in the street, in halls, or anywhere else. The national committee arranged for meetings in the city of Pittsburgh. While we were there the city council was in session. We went to the city council and explained the purposes of our committee, showed what our plan was, and in the face of that the mayor of McKeesport denied the right of the committee to hold meetings. Then we took the matter to the American Federation of Labor. President Gompers wrote to the mayor of McKeesport, setting forth the rights he had in the premises. That letter was ignored.

President Gompers then wrote the Governor of Pennsylvania, and that letter, likewise, was ignored. President Gompers's work took him to Europe at about that time, and we asked Secretary Morrison to take the matter up. Secretary Morrison wrote the Governor of Pennsylvania of the situation that existed in McKeesport, and the governor replied that he would use his best efforts to see that the rights of the organization were respected in McKeesport; but since that time the same opposition has continued, and no relief has been secured.

We continued to go into McKeesport, however, to distribute literature and call meetings. A large number of men responded to our call. Thousands of men in McKeesport wanted to be a part of the labor movement, they wanted the right to stand up as citizens of this country and do the things which the Constitution of the United States says they have a right to do.

I want now to read a letter written by the chief of police of McKeesport.

"McKEESPORT, June 14, 1919.

"MR. WILLIAM MURPHY, *City*.

"SIR: Hon. Geo. H. Lyle, mayor of the city of McKeesport, has this day notified me to notify you, as the organizer of the American Federation of Labor, that there will be no more street meetings held in this city. This means that the meeting called for Monday, June 15, 1919, at Fifth and Market Streets, at 3 p. m., will not be held. Any attempt made to disobey this notice will be met with the arrest of any person attempting to speak.

"JAMES REDINGTON,

"*Chief of Police.*"

The meeting on that date was held, and the speaker representing our committee talked in McKeesport on that occasion. We proceeded to go on with our work and to arrange other meetings. While we would rather talk in a hall, if we were denied the use of a hall, we would rather meet on the street or in a vacant lot. Here is the attitude of the mayor in regard to meetings. This is a telegram from one of our organizers at McKeesport, addressed to Secretary Foster:

"Saw Mayor Lyle, of McKeesport, to-day. Refused permission for a hall meeting, and prohibited street meeting for American Federation of Labor."

That is in relation to the meeting to be held to-morrow afternoon under the same circumstances as previous meetings were held. Secretary Foster, of the national committee, is going to speak in McKeesport to-morrow afternoon at 3 o'clock.

We have taken the matter up with the Secretary of Labor; that department is thoroughly aware of the situation; representatives of the department have been in those places and have seen the difficulty with which we are carrying on our work. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Department of Justice with no results. Now, we are asking this convention, in this resolution, to cause a congressional investigation, or such other investigation as will bring about the rights which the citizenship of this country can not permit to be denied them.

This right of free speech and free assemblage must be fought for, regardless of consequences, and I say to you that America will mean nothing to us if we have not the right of free speech and free assemblage.

While I have this opportunity, I want to say to the delegates that this is a most vital and important work. It is a thing which affects the future of every organization and of every individual. If we break this opposition of the steel trust the real opposition to the labor movement of this country will be removed. That is the one big thing, if nothing else is to be obtained in this work. We hope to be able to accomplish that; and it is possible of accomplishment. There are about a half a million men connected with the iron and steel industry; a large proportion of them are mechanics, but the great majority of them are common laborers. I presume if our skilled trades would proceed to make arrangements with the steel industry, we could very readily bring within our lives all that we desire, but in doing that we would have to pay the price of leaving that common labor, which is in the majority, to the future mercy of the steel trust. That price we will never pay; never, never.

In the 10 months since this committee was created, 100,000 men have been brought into the fold of our organization. Twenty-four international unions are cooperating and 100,000 men out of the steel industry have been brought into their organizations. If that result can be brought about in 10 months, we shall be able, through the concentrated efforts of the international organizations and with the support of the American Federation of Labor, to bring the other

400,000 men in the steel industry into the labor movement inside of the next year.

That is the constructive work we have been engaged in, and I hope when you leave this convention, with all the other responsibilities and duties you have, you will help this situation. It is a vital and important matter and means much to the future of the labor movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Gompers, can we not get down to brass tacks?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think we can now, sir. That is the immediate cause of the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You have traced the matter up to the time when Mr. Fitzpatrick succeeded you?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The efforts to unionize these mills and the efforts against that, which seem to have caused the troubles. After he became chairman he narrated to us yesterday what took place, down to the final calling of the strike.

Now, Mr. Gompers, we would like to hear from you as to why the strike was not postponed as the President requested, until after this conference.

Mr. GOMPERS. In just a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. In your own way, Mr. Gompers.

Mr. GOMPERS. The organizing committee reported to me on a number of conferences held among the 24 executive officers of the international trades-unions involved in the industry that up to the June convention of the American Federation of Labor, there were approximately 100,000 iron and steel workers which had been organized during the previous year. That within the period of six weeks after the Atlantic City Convention, an additional 50,000 had been organized. I am giving round numbers, Mr. Chairman. That the companies of the corporation had become more active and more unjust and more tyrannous to those who were employed, had discharged large numbers of men who were known to be members of the organizations; that anyone who was a spokesman was victimized and thrown out of employment; that the men were forbidden to hold public meetings in this place and that place, and that when they attempted to do so they were dispersed.

About the 27th or 28th of August Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Davis, of the Iron and Steel Workers, Mr. Foster, secretary of the organizing committee, and myself, with Mr. Hannon of the International Association of Machinists, by appointment, had the honor of a conference with the President, where we presented to him this entire situation and related to him the efforts which had been made to have a conference with Judge Gary and the inability to secure such a conference. The President expressed the belief that, in his judgment, a conference might be helpful to adjust the differences. We asked him whether he would not use his good offices to try to bring about a conference with Judge Gary and a committee of the employees of his corporation. We presented to him the thought that the subsidiary companies are under the general jurisdiction of the United States Steel Corporation, and that if the corporation, speaking for the corporation itself, as well as for its subsidiary companies, would have a conference with a committee representing the men in the various plants of the corporation, we would regard that as being

proper. The President seemed to be in favor of our position that a conference should be held. I am not divulging any confidence. I would not do that if I was conscious of it, particularly in the case of the President, or in the case of any other man, but the President said that he would make an effort to try to bring about such a conference, and try to prevail upon Judge Gary to permit such a conference to take place.

The President, I am advised, did make such effort, and upon a telegram being sent to him asking what result had accrued from the efforts he had made, said that he was a bit discouraged, and yet would not give up trying. That is substantially his answer.

The committee having the organization of the men in charge met at the office of the American Federation of Labor. I met with them, and the entire situation was gone over.

On the following Monday—that is, I think, on September 8—I met with the committee again and advised that the strike, if possible, should be deferred. On the following day the officers of the 24 organizations, together with the committee, met, and when the reports were given, up to the minute, of the situation existing, the men—the responsible officers of the organizations involved—decided by unanimous vote to inform the men that, in compliance with their expressed will, unless a conference was held with Judge Gary and the committee in the meantime, they would be authorized to strike on September 22.

I had left Washington on the Monday preceding the Tuesday when that meeting was held. That day my father passed away and I was not in the best possible frame of mind to do anything.

On Wednesday a telegram was received from the President, addressed to me at the offices of the American Federation of Labor in Washington, asking me whether I could not intervene and endeavor to prevail upon the men to defer the strike until after the presidential industrial conference of October 6.

Over long-distance telephone I dictated a letter to my secretary, addressed to Mr. Fitzpatrick, in which the telegram of the President was quoted, and urging that the President's request be complied with and such action taken as would bring about that result. That letter was written and mailed to Mr. Fitzpatrick, addressed to him at Chicago, was it not?

MR. FITZPATRICK. No; I got it here.

MR. GOMPERS. It was handed to Mr. Fitzpatrick, who was still in Washington. A few days after that a letter was received from Mr. Fitzpatrick, speaking of the conditions which obtained; that it was impossible to hold the men; that, even if the committee would assume the fullest authority that they had and tried to prevent the strike, the men were in such a frame of mind that they could not be prevented from striking. They would strike, whatever the course of the committee would be.

SENATOR STERLING. May I ask a question just there?

MR. GOMPERS. I would like to state this chronologically, if I can.

SENATOR STERLING. What committee is meant there?

MR. GOMPERS. The organizing committee of the iron and steel workers, or the workers in the iron and steel industry, and this committee, selected and elected by the 24 officers of the international trade-unions involved in the iron and steel industry, and speaking in

the name then of more than 180,000 iron and steel workers, which had been organized within the past year and a half. Now, they spoke with that authority.

Senator STERLING. Twenty-four in number?

Mr. GOMPERS. The 24 international trade-union officers. They were authorized. At my suggestion, the entire committee and the officers of the 24 organizations again met at Pittsburgh, I think, three or four or five days afterwards.

Senator PHIPPS. Will you kindly at that point state the number of the special committee, in addition to the representatives of the 24 unions, so that that can be made clear. How many members are on the special committee to conduct the strike?

Mr. GOMPERS. The general committee consists of the 24 officers of the National Trade Unions.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. GOMPERS. The executive committee for the purpose of conference was Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Tighe, president of the Iron, Steel and Tin Workers organization, Mr. Foster, secretary of the organizing committee, Mr. Hannon and Mr. Edward Evans, of the electrical workers, a committee of five. I offered to join them if it was agreeable both to Judge Gary and to the committee. I do not have any care to impose more work upon myself than I am already required to do.

I may say that in the time between the meeting at which the date was set for the strike and the declaration of the strike, or rather the time for the strike, I had authorized my secretary to send a copy of my letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick to the 24 officers of the international unions. Several of them had declared in favor of postponing the strike until after the president's conference. All of them were called into the meeting at Pittsburgh, which was held three or four or five days after the declaration of September 9. I am informed that the conference at Pittsburgh was held September 16 or 17, when my letter was read, when my letter to Mr. Tighe was read in response to a letter from him, and the letter from Mr. Johnson, president of the International Association of Machinists was read, in which he expressed the view that it would be the best thing to comply with the President's request. Two or three other organizations had sent word by letter or telegraph, I do not know which, asking or suggesting that the strike be postponed until after the presidential conference.

When all these met at Pittsburgh and the actual situation was presented to them, not only by the committee but by the organizers representative of the men in the various districts, the men who had written to me, the officers of the organizations which had declared that they favored a postponement, on the ground voted together, all of them, unanimously, with the others, in adhering to the original date for the strike, and in letters to me several of them who had written to me before stating that they favored the postponement of the strike, declared that they could not maintain that position in view of the reports which they had received from the representatives of the men in the various districts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe in your own mind that their reasons were sufficient?

Mr. GOMPERS. I can not escape that conclusion, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what were those reasons that forced you to that conclusion?



**Mr. GOMPERS.** The reasons which I have already given you, sir, that men, not impulsive men, but intelligent men, and men conscious of the responsibility of it all, who had declared that they favored the postponement of the date of the strike until after the President's conference was held, when they had come in close contact with the real conditions of the propaganda, of the terrorism, of the corporation's representatives, of the wholesale discharge of men for no other reason than that they belonged to the union, were convinced that it meant either disintegration of the organization because the men would lose confidence, had lost or practically had lost confidence by the mere suggestion that the strike would be postponed. Further, that notwithstanding what any of the officials of the trade unions would have done, regardless of what the committee would have done, the strike would have occurred anyway, a haphazard, loose, disjoined, unorganized strike, without leadership, without consultation, without advice. It was simply a choice whether the strike would take place under the guidance and leadership of men who have proven their worth or under the leadership of some one who might spring up for the moment.

**Senator STERLING.** Was it brought to your knowledge, Mr. Gompers, as to where men were being discharged simply because they belonged to the union by the steel corporations?

**Mr. GOMPERS.** It was brought to my knowledge in the reports which reached me and in letters written to me from various districts and sources. They had been employed by the company for a considerable term of years. There was no complaint found with their work or their faithfulness. Some had become members of the union within recent times, perhaps. They had then been discharged, and without any cause assigned.

**Senator STERLING.** That was made the reason for their discharge, the fact that they had recently become members of the union?

**Mr. GOMPERS.** Corporations are not accustomed to give reasons for the discharge of men that belong to the union.

**Senator STERLING.** But do you know it to be the reason for their discharge—that they belonged to the union?

**Mr. GOMPERS.** I am informed that in many instances whole groups of men were informed that they would have to make the choice of remaining members of the union or remaining in the employment of the company.

**Senator STERLING.** Can you state at what point men were discharged because they were members of the union?

**Mr. GOMPERS.** I think I can furnish that information, sir.

**Senator STERLING.** Well, we would be glad to have you do so. I think it is very important in this connection.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Mr. Gompers, Mr. Fitzpatrick stated yesterday, as I remember his statement, that if the conference had been held with Judge Gary, if he had granted a conference, the strike would not have been called. In other words, that the reason for the strike was the failure to secure a conference with Judge Gary. Do you agree to that view of the matter?

**Mr. GOMPERS.** With this supplemental reason. I do not think that a mere conference, in which pleasantries might be exchanged—that that was the real purpose of the conference. The conference implied the discussion of the grievances of the men and the effort to reach an adjustment of these grievances, and if that conference had

been permitted to take place, in which such a frank discussion could be held, I am firmly convinced that the strike would not have occurred.

The CHAIRMAN. That did not mean necessarily the adoption of every one of the demands or requests which might be made; those were the basis for discussion?

Mr. GOMPER. Certainly. We do not expect to remedy all the grievances of life in a day. We do hope for improvement of the conditions of labor in a day.

There is one thing that must be understood, that the time has come when the workers have a better understanding of their rights in the industrial, economic, social and political life of our country and of our time, and that one among these concepts is the right of the workers to be heard through a representative and spokesman of their own. The Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of all our States provide that the right of a person to be heard by counsel, the right to be heard by counsel in any fact of life in which they are involved, the recognition—

Senator STERLING (interposing). Do you mean by that, Mr. Gompers, counsel at law or by an attorney at law?

Mr. GOMPERS. No, thank you. No, thank you.

Senator STERLING. I wondered, I just wondered.

Mr. GOMPERS. A counsellor is not necessarily a lawyer, and my experience is that the less we have to do with lawyers the better. The workers have the right to be heard by counsel of their own choosing, of their own selection.

No one underestimates the magnificent guaranty of that right as a citizen before the courts of our country and of our States, but as a matter of fact the working people employed by corporations and large interests, industrial concerns, have more interests involved in their daily vocation, life and work which require representation by counsel than they have before the courts. They want counsel of their own choosing who can speak for them in the common language of our country, and who can present their views as probably the average worker may not have the ability, the courage, or the opportunity to present. They want for counsel men who can speak as intelligent, constructive citizens, as fellow-workers; men who have felt the wrongs and the injustice of factory life, of mill life; men whom the workers believe have the intelligence (and, if I may say so, a little more polish than we generally have), who can be independent in so far as we are concerned to present and to argue the matters with the employer or the employer's representatives. The right to be heard by counsel is inherent in the political and public life of our country, and we ask for the right to be heard by counsel in our industrial life.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Gompers, I want to direct your thought to this. We might just as well be perfectly frank about the situation. You have probably read a speech on the floor of the House made a few days ago concerning Mr. Foster. The papers are carrying reported statements of Mr. Foster, I do not know the dates they were purported to have been made, but signed "Yours for the I. W. W." and "Yours for the revolution," and things of that kind, and Mr. Foster is quite a factor, apparently, in this strike. Now, it is charged and has been charged on the floors of Congress that the American

Federation of Labor is not really squarely behind this strike. No one ever imputes any question about your patriotism. You did as much to win the war as anybody, and everybody knows it. But the American Federation of Labor, they say, is not squarely behind the strike, but that radicals like Foster, with views which are quoted from his books, whether they be ancient or modern, I know not, but statements made by him and reports of Mr. Duncan, who, I think, is vice president of the American Federation of Labor, is he not?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. From the Budapest conference about Mr. Foster—

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That that class of men, radicals, who are against the institutions of our country, are using this in a way and getting into the American Federation of Labor and trying to control it in that way. Now, that is a pretty blunt question and a frank question, and I would like to have you discuss it.

Mr. GOMPERS. In response to the question of Senator Phipps I made a very brief reference to Mr. Foster. I want to amplify that a bit.

I have heard it said, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book." That is the sum total of the antagonism directed to Mr. Foster. He wrote a book, and when a young man dogmatically laid down the phantasies of his brain. Let me say, sir, that no one had a greater antipathy toward the personality of another than I had toward Mr. Foster. I mean, toward his attitude. I did not care how he looked or appeared, but to me a man who would assume the position that Mr. Foster took at the Zurich conference when representing the I. W. W. and claiming recognition by that conference he wanted Mr. James Duncan, a magnificent, intelligent man, a man of high type of character, excluded from the conference, was in about the same category with Mr. Haywood and others of that type.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that conference?

Mr. GOMPERS. That was about 1910, something like that, or 1911.

The CHAIRMAN. And he appeared at that conference as the representative of the I. W. W.?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir; that is, he so claimed. I have no authority for saying that he did, but he so claimed. Then Mr. Foster wrote that pamphlet.

Senator McKELLER. When was that written?

Mr. GOMPERS. Oh, about a year or so after. That pamphlet on "Syndicalism" carried out the thought that he presented to the Zurich International Labor Conference.

I should say, in passing, that Mr. Foster was not admitted by that international meeting but that Mr. Duncan was seated as the representative of the American Federation of Labor.

About a year after that meeting at Zurich—no, about two years after the Zurich meeting, and about a year after that pamphlet had been printed, I was at a meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor, conducted under the presidency of Mr. John Fitzpatrick. I was called upon to make and did make an address. One of the delegates arose after I had concluded and expressed himself as being thoroughly in accord with what President Gompers had said; that it would be wise for the men in the labor movement of Chicago

and of the entire country to follow the thought and the philosophy and so forth which President Gompers had enunciated in his address. I did not know who was the delegate. He was a new personality to me. I might say that I was rather flattered and pleased at the fact that there was general comment of approval of not only my utterances but of the delegate who had first spoken after I had concluded.

Much to my amazement, after the meeting was over I was informed that the delegate was G. Z. Foster, the man who had appeared in Zurich and the man who had written that pamphlet. I think I addressed a letter to him expressing my appreciation of his change of attitude, his change of mind, and pointing out to him that pursuing that constructive policy he could be of real service to the cause of labor. He was a man of ability, a man of good presence, gentle in expression, a commander of good English, and I encouraged him. I was willing to help build a golden bridge for mine enemy to pass over. I was willing to welcome an erring brother into the ranks of constructive labor. And in view of what Mr. Foster has done in helping to bring about better conditions among the stockyard workers of Chicago and of the balance of the country, in view of the lawful, honorable methods which he has pursued in this situation now under investigation, he is entitled to have something better than a mistaken past thrown not only in his teeth and in his face, but held up to the contumely of the world in order now to make his activities impossible or to neutralize them. That is the situation, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You say, then, do you, Mr. Gompers, that his views expressed by him in his book on "Syndicalism" and his views expressed at the time you speak of have changed?

Mr. GOMPERS. I have no doubt, and I have no hesitancy in saying so, sir.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is a list of the 24 organizations and the names of their executive officers which constitute the general organizing and strike committee. Mr. Foster is not an executive officer; he is not a member of that body. He has been chosen by them as secretary to perform the secretarial work.

Speaking of the officers of these 24 organizations, may I say to you that on March 12, 1917, three weeks before the President of the United States appeared before Congress and presented the indictment against the German Imperial Government, the representatives of the organizations of labor of America met in conference on March 12, 1917, in this city in the American Federation's executive council room and there adopted a declaration of what the attitude of labor should be, whether we remained at peace or were drawn into the war.

First, however, I will submit the list spoken of.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to receive it.

(The list above referred to here appears in the record in full as follows):

Blacksmiths, International Brotherhood of; J. L. Kline, president, 608 South Dearborn Street, box 5, Chicago, Ill.

Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders of America, Brotherhood of; L. Weyand, acting president, room 15, Law Building, Kansas City, Kans.

Brick and Clay Workers of America, The United; Frank Kasten, president, 166 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers, International Union of America; William Bowen, president, University Park Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, International Association; P. J. Morrin, president, American Central Life Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

Coopers International Union of North America; A. C. Hughes, president, 1012 Boyleston Street, Newton Highlands, Mass.

Electrical Workers of America, International Brotherhood of; J. P. Noonan, acting president, 406-18 Reisch Building, Springfield, Ill.

Foundry Employees, International Brotherhood of; A. R. Linn, president, 810 Chestnut Street, St. Louis, Mo.

Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers' Union of North America, International; D. D'Allessandro, president, 25 School Street, Quincy, Mass.

Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, Amalgamated Association of; M. F. Tighe, president, 501-506 House Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Machinists, International Association of; L. H. Johnston, president, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.

Metal Polishers International Union; W. W. Britton, president, box No. 641, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, International Union of; C. H. Moyer, president, 510 Denham Building, Denver, Colo.

Mine Workers of America, United; Frank J. Hayes, president, 1102-1109 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

Moulders' Union of North America, International; J. F. Valentine, president, Commercial Tribune Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Pattern Makers' League of North America; James Wilson, president, 1008-1009 Second National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Plumbers and Steam Fitters of the United States and Canada, United Association of; John R. Alpine, president, 411-416 Bush Temple of Music, Chicago, Ill.

Quarryworkers, International Union of North America; Fred W. Sutor, Secretary-Treasurer, Scamplini Building, Barre, Vt.

Carmen of America, Brotherhood Railway; M. F. Ryan, president, 503 Hall Building, Kansas City, Mo.

Seamen's Union of America, International; Andrew Fureseth, president, 44 East Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Metal Workers' International Alliance, Amalgamated Sheet; J. J. Hynes, president, 122 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Firemen, International Brotherhood of Stationary; Timothy Healy, president, 211 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.

Engineers, International Union of Steam and Operating Engineers; Milton Snellings, president, 6334 Yale Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Switchmen's Union of North America; S. E. Heberling, president, 326 Brisbane Hall, Buffalo, N. Y.

Steam Shovelmen and Dredgemen, International Brotherhood of; W. M. Welsh, president, 39 Cortlandt Street, New York City, N. Y.

**Mr. GOMPERS.** I would like to submit a copy of the declarations spoken of to the record.

**The CHAIRMAN.** We will be very glad to have that, Mr. Gompers.

#### AMERICAN LABOR'S POSITION IN PEACE OR IN WAR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 12, 1917.*

A conference of the representatives of the national and international trade-unions of America, called by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, was held in the American Federation of Labor Building March 12, 1917, in which conference the representatives of affiliated national and international trade-unions and the railroad brotherhoods participated.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor had the subject matter for three days under advisement prior to the conference and submitted a declaration to the conference. The entire day was given over to a discussion of the recommendation and such suggestions as were submitted. After a thorough discussion, the following document was adopted by a unanimous vote:

"We speak for millions of Americans. We are not a sect. We are not a party. We represent the organizations held together by the pressure of our common needs. We represent the part of the Nation closest to the fundamentals of life. Those we represent wield the Nation's tools and grapple with the

forces that are brought under control in our material civilization. The power and use of industrial tools is greater than the tools of war and will in time supersede agencies of destruction.

"A world war is on. The time has not yet come when war has been abolished.

"Whether we approve it or not, we must recognize that war is a situation with which we must reckon. The present European war, involving as it does the majority of civilized nations and affecting the industry and commerce of the whole world, threatens at any moment to draw all countries, including our own, into the conflict. Our immediate problem, then, is to bring to bear upon war conditions instructive forethought, vision, principles of human welfare and conservation that should direct our course in every eventuality of life. The way to avert war is to establish constructive agencies for justice in times of peace and thus control for peace situations and forces that might otherwise result in war.

"The methods of modern warfare, its new tactics, its vast organization, both military and industrial, present problems vastly different from those of previous wars. But the Nation's problems afford an opportunity for the establishment of new freedom and wider opportunities for all the people. Modern warfare includes contests between workshops, factories, the land, financial and transportation resources of the countries involved, and necessarily applies to the relations between employers and employees; and as our own country now faces an impending peril, it is fitting that the masses of the people of the United States should take counsel and determine what course they shall pursue should a crisis arise necessitating the protection of our Republic and the defense of the ideals for which it stands.

"In the struggle between the forces of democracy and special privilege, for just and historic reasons the masses of the people necessarily represent the ideals and the institutions of democracy. There is in organized society one potential organization whose purpose is to further these ideals and institutions—the organized labor movement.

"In no previous war has the organized labor movement taken a directing part.

"Labor has now reached an understanding of its rights, of its powers and resources, of its value and contributions to society, and must make definite constructive proposals.

"It is timely that we frankly present experiences and conditions which in former times have prevented nations from benefiting by the voluntary, whole-hearted cooperation of wage earners in war time, and then make suggestions how these hindrances to our national strength and vigor can be removed.

"War has never put a stop to the necessity for struggle to establish and maintain industrial rights. Wage earners in war times must, as has been said, keep one eye on the exploiters at home and the other upon the enemy threatening the national Government. Such exploitation made it impossible for a warring Nation to mobilize effectively its full strength for outward defense.

"We maintain that it is the fundamental step in preparedness for the Nation to set its own house in order and to establish at home justice in relations between men. Previous wars, for whatever purpose waged, developed new opportunities for exploiting wage earners. Not only was there failure to recognize the necessity for protecting rights of workers that they might give that whole-hearted service to the country that can come only when every citizen enjoys rights, freedom, and opportunity, but under guise of national necessity, labor was stripped of its means of defense against enemies at home and was robbed of the advantages, the protections, the guarantees of justice that had been achieved after ages of struggle. For these reasons workers have felt that no matter what the result of war, as wage earners they generally lost.

"In previous times labor had no representatives in the councils authorized to deal with the conduct of war. The rights, interests, and welfare of workers were autocratically sacrificed for the slogan of "national safety."

"The European war has demonstrated the dependence of the governments upon the cooperation of the masses of the people. Since the masses perform indispensable service, it follows that they should have a voice in determining the conditions upon which they give service.

"The workers of America make known their beliefs, their demands, and their purposes through a voluntary agency which they have established—the organized labor movement. This agency is not only the representative of those who directly constitute it, but it is the representative of all those persons who have common problems and purposes but who have not yet organized for their achievement.

"Whether in peace or in war the organized labor movement seeks to make all else subordinate to human welfare and human opportunity. The labor movement stands as the defender of this principle and undertakes to protect the wealth-producers against the exorbitant greed of special interests, against profiteering, against exploitation, against the detestable methods of irresponsible greed, against the inhumanity and crime of heartless corporations and employers.

"Labor demands the right in war times to be the recognized defender of wage earners against the same forces which in former wars have made national necessity an excuse for more ruthless methods.

"As the representatives of the wage earners we assert that conditions of work and pay in Government employment and in all occupations should conform to principles of human welfare and justice.

"A nation can not make an effective defense against an outside danger if groups of citizens are asked to take part in a war though smarting with a sense of keen injustice inflicted by the Government they are expected to and will defend.

"The cornerstone of national defense is justice in fundamental relations of life—economic justice.

"The one agency which accomplishes this for the workers is the organized labor movement. The greatest step that can be made for national defense is not to bind and throttle the organized labor movement, but to afford its greatest scope and opportunity for voluntary effective cooperation in spirit and in action.

"During the long period in which it has been establishing itself, the labor movement has become a dynamic force in organizing the human side of industry and commerce. It is a great social factor, which must be recognized in all plans which affect wage earners.

"Whether planning for peace or war the Government must recognize the organized labor movement as the agency through which it must cooperate with wage earners.

"Industrial justice is the right of those living within our country. With this right there is associated obligation. In war time obligation takes the form of service in defense of the Republic against enemies.

"We recognize that this service may be either military or industrial, both equally essential for national defense. We hold this to be incontrovertible; that the Government which demands that men and women give their labor power, their bodies, or their lives to its service should also demand the service, in the interest of these human beings, of all wealth and the products of human toil—property.

"We hold that if workers may be asked in time of national peril or emergency to give more exhausting service than the principles of human welfare warrant, that service should be asked only when accompanied by increased guarantees and safeguards, and when the profits which the employer shall secure from the industry in which they are engaged have been limited to fixed percentages.

"We declare that such determination of profits should be based on costs of processes actually needed for product.

"Workers have no delusions regarding the policy which property owners and exploiting employers pursue in peace or in war, and they also recognize that, wrapped up with the safety of this Republic, are ideals of democracy, a heritage which the masses of the people received from our forefathers, who fought that liberty might live in this country—a heritage that is to be maintained and handed down to each generation with undiminished power and usefulness.

"The labor movement recognizes the value of freedom, and it knows that freedom and rights can be maintained only by those willing to assert their claims and to defend their rights. The American labor movement has always opposed unnecessary conflicts and all wars for aggrandizement, exploitation, and enslavement, and yet it has done its part in the world's revolutions, in the struggles to establish greater freedom, democratic institutions and ideals of human justice.

"Our labor movement distrusts and protests against militarism, because it knows that militarism represents privilege and is the tool of special interests, exploiters, and despots. But while it opposes militarism, it holds that it is the duty of a nation to defend itself against injustice and invasion.

"The menace of militarism arises through isolating the defensive functions of the State from civic activities and from creating military agencies out of

touch with the masses of the people. Isolation is subversive to democracy—it harbors and nurtures the germs of arbitrary power.

"The labor movement demands that a clear differentiation be made against military service for the nation and police duty, and that military service should be carefully distinguished from service in industrial disputes.

"We hold that industrial service shall be deemed equally meritorious as military service. Organization for industrial and commercial service is upon a different basis from military service—the civic ideals still dominate. This should be recognized in mobilizing for this purpose. The same voluntary institutions that organized industrial, commercial, and transportation workers in times of peace will best take care of the same problems in time of war.

"It is fundamental, therefore, that the Government cooperate with the American organized labor movement for this purpose. Service in Government factories and private establishments, in transportation agencies, all should conform to trade union standards.

"The guaranties of human conservation should be recognized in war as well as in peace. Wherever changes in the organization of industry are necessary upon a war basis, they should be made in accord with plans agreed upon by representatives of the Government and those engaged and employed in the industry. We recognize that in war, in certain employments requiring high skill, it is necessary to retain in industrial service the workers specially fitted therefor. In any eventuality, when women may be employed we insist that equal pay for equal work shall prevail without regard to sex.

"Finally, in order to safeguard all the interests of the wage earners, organized labor should have representation on all agencies determining and administering policies for national defense. It is particularly important that organized labor should have representatives on all boards authorized to control publicity during war times. The workers have suffered much injustice in war times by limitations upon their right to speak freely and to secure publicity for their just grievances.

"Organized labor has earned the right to make these demands. It is the agency that, in all countries, stands for human rights and is the defender of the welfare and interests of the masses of the people. It is an agency that has international recognition which is not seeking to rob, exploit, or corrupt foreign governments, but instead seeks to maintain human rights and interests the world over, nor does it have to dispel suspicion nor prove its motives either at home or abroad.

"The present war discloses the struggle between the institutions of democracy and those of autocracy. As a Nation we should profit from the experiences of other nations. Democracy can not be established by patches upon an autocratic system. The foundations of civilized intercourse between individuals must be organized upon principles of democracy and scientific principles of human welfare. Then a national structure can be perfected in harmony with humanitarian idealism—a structure that will stand the tests of the necessities of peace or war.

"We, the officers of the national and international trade-unions of America in national conference assembled in the Capital of our Nation, hereby pledge ourselves in peace or in war, in stress or in storm, to stand unreservedly by the standards of liberty and the safety and preservation of the institutions and ideals of our Republic.

"In this solemn hour of our Nation's life, it is our earnest hope that our Republic may be safeguarded in its unswerving desire for peace; that our people may be spared the horrors and the burdens of war; that they may have the opportunity to cultivate and develop the arts of peace, human brotherhood, and a higher civilization.

"But, despite all our endeavors and hopes, should our country be drawn into the maelstrom of the European conflict, we, with these ideals of liberty and justice herein declared, as the indispensable basis for national policies, offer our services to our country in every field of activity to defend, safeguard, and preserve the Republic of the United States of America against its enemies whomsoever they may be, and we call upon our fellow workers and fellow citizens in the whole name of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity to devotedly and patriotically give like service."

Mr. GOMPERS. I would like, if you will permit me, and to illustrate a special point, that you allow my secretary to read three paragraphs of that declaration.



The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have him do so.

Mr. WILLIAM C. ROBERTS, secretary to Mr. Gompers (reading):

We, the officers of the National and International Trade Unions of America, in national conference assembled in the Capital of our Nation, hereby pledge ourselves in peace or in war, in stress or in storm, to stand unreservedly by the standards of liberty and the safety and preservation of the institutions and ideals of our Republic.

In this solemn hour of our Nation's life, it is our earnest hope that our Republic may be safeguarded in its unswerving desire for peace; that our people may be spared the horrors and the burdens of war; that they may have the opportunity to cultivate and develop the arts of peace, human brotherhood, and a higher civilization.

But, despite all our endeavors and hopes, should our country be drawn into the maelstrom of the European conflict, we, with these ideals of liberty and justice herein declared, as the indispensable basis for national policies, offer our services to our country in every field of activity to defend, safeguard, and preserve the Republic of the United States of America against its enemies whomsoever they may be, and we call upon our fellow workers and fellow citizens in the holy name of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity to devotedly and patriotically give like service.

Mr. GOMPERS. That declaration, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, was adopted by the unanimous vote of these conferees, all responsible officers of the national trade-unions of America, of which these 24 organizations form a part.

The CHAIRMAN. And representing how many men?

Mr. GOMPERS. I should say approximately about one and three-quarter; or two million men.

The CHAIRMAN. I have just one more question which I would like to have in the record. If Mr. Foster had not changed his mind on these fundamental questions from the time that you speak of, I take it that you would not be willing to have him do anything with this strike situation, would you?

Mr. GOMPERS. Not at all. On the contrary, as I stated in the early part of my remarks this morning, I was elected the first chairman of this conference committee in June, 1918. Mr. Foster was elected secretary. I would not have served with Mr. Foster if he had not changed his views.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to change the trend of questioning that is intended to be pursued further, but I should like to present some other matters.

May I say this, that Mr. Foster not only declared to others and to me that if any time I believed his occupancy of the secretaryship of the organizing and conference committee was inimical to the interests of the organizations or to the iron and steel workers, his resignation could be had at any minute on simple request or intimation.

I have here a copy of the "Iron Age" of May 29, 1919, and in it there is an article by Director Hines of the United States Railroad Administration. May I read a few excerpts from that article, sir, or have my secretary do so?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

(Mr. Roberts reading:)

The Steel Corporation's annual report to its stockholders that after paying all wages and other operating and maintenance expenses and allowing most liberally for renewals and paying interest on debts of subsidiary companies, and also taxes other than war taxes and excess-profits taxes, it had net

earnings on all rolled-steel products of \$21.58 per ton in 1916, \$35.73 per ton in 1917, and \$33.53 in 1918.

It is a remarkable fact that in the calendar years 1917 and 1918 the net earnings of the Steel Corporation aggregated approximately \$1,000,000,000, being in excess of the annual rental which Congress has sanctioned as reasonable for practically the entire railroad mileage in the United States. It is true the Steel Corporation had to pay out of these net earnings heavy excess-profits taxes to the Government, but even after paying these taxes, making liberal allowance for depreciation and extraordinary replacement funds, and after paying interest on bonds and 7 per cent on preferred stock, there remained an earning of 39.2 per cent on its common stock in 1917 and of 22 per cent on its common stock in 1918.

Mr. GOMPERS. In another part of Mr. Hines's address he says:

The situation in the steel industry is of greatest moment to the American public. The United States Steel Corporation is the largest producer and controls approximately 50 per cent of the output. It takes the lead in maintaining a price which, if its reports to stockholders are reliable, indicates a grossly excessive profit, and it does this for the avowed purpose of protecting alleged high-cost producers which, however, so far as they make detailed reports on the subject to their stockholders, also indicate large profits. In other words, the Steel Corporation appears to take the position that for the protection of other prosperous steel producers it is unwilling to initiate any competition in the steel industry and naturally these other producers are glad to follow this lead, and, incidentally, this position enables it to continue the enjoyment of very high profits.

This condition operates to suspend the law of supply and demand when it could work in favor of the consumer, but it leaves that law free to operate with the greatest effect, when it can work in favor of the manufacturer. This situation also works to deprive the public of the benefits of the increased efficiency due to the great combinations in the steel business. Those combinations are the result of public acquiescence, and yet all the benefits of them go not to the public but to the private owners. The more powerful the combinations become the more successful they are in keeping up prices.

These reasons lead me to reiterate that the prices in question are unreasonably high at present, and will become progressively more unreasonable as business improves and conditions become more nearly normal.

Mr. GOMPERS. In 1910 the United States Steel Corporation had become unusually and perniciously active in its campaign to prevent and suppress any attempt at organization among the workers. At that time the 7-day week was entirely in vogue and the 365 days a year was the practice.

Senator McKELLAR. How many hours a day?

Mr. GOMPERS. Twelve hours a day and, as I said, when the change of shifts came, once in two weeks, the hours were 24 of continuous labor.

Senator STERLING. May I ask a question here which has reference to the 12 hours a day? That is one of the 12 demands, the 8-hour day. As I understand the reading of Mr. Fitzpatrick's address, he said that they had been granted or offered the eight-hour day as a kind of sop, if I remember the reading of that address correctly. I would like to have those things reconciled.

Senator McKELLAR. They have the eight-hour day now, throughout the steel industry, do they not, or what is the situation to-day?

Mr. GOMPERS. My information is that it very generally prevails.

Senator McKELLAR. The eight-hour day?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes. I may say this, that, whether granted as a sop or not, which is not the question, but due to the declarations of the Labor Board, the War Labor Conference Board, due to agitation for the establishment of a normal working day of eight hours, and by a

systematic agitation, which finally reached the United States Steel Corporation some little time ago, there was an order for the eight-hour day. I am informed that it is more in the order than in the observance of that order, and that the working day is from 10 to 11 hours.

Senator STERLING. When was that order made?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think it was in the fall of last year.

Senator McKELLAR. Will you tell us whether that double time every two weeks on change of shift, that you mentioned, is still in vogue? In other words, do they have to work a double day of 16 hours every 2 weeks, as before, and is the 7-day schedule still in effect?

Mr. GOMPERS. With the change to the 8-hour day, by order, it involves 16 hours continuous work.

Senator McKELLAR. What about Sundays?

Mr. GOMPERS. But that is on paper. The actual fact is that they work from 20 to 22 hours on these changes of shifts.

Senator McKELLAR. What do they do about Sundays at the present time? Do they work seven days a week?

Mr. GOMPERS. In many, many instances.

Senator McKELLAR. They still work seven days in the week?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. While you are on that, Mr. Gompers, can you give us any information, in view of the statement that the wages paid aggregated \$40, \$50, and \$60 a day, as to the amount of wage you paid?

Mr. GOMPERS. I can not accurately. Mr. Chairman.

Senator McKELLAR. Will you give us the figures for the record as to the wages in the steel industry, as compared with wages in other industry, for instance, the railroads?

Mr. GOMPERS. That is a big job, which even the United States Government has not yet been able to ascertain. We, with our poverty-stricken organization, the organization of the poor, have not the facilities to obtain that information. However, we will do the best we can.

Senator McKELLAR. I thought possibly you had some figures in reference to that, and if you have we will be glad to have them.

Mr. GOMPERS. That is also one of those orders on paper. I may say this, Mr. Chairman, in response to your question about the \$40 to \$45 a day pay, that it might be well to ascertain how many of those are in the plants. I do know, of course, that it is the favorite pastime of big interests to pay a few very large salaries and wages, very much like the man driving a cart with bit of a nag, supposed to be a horse, having along with it dangling a few carrots and things before the nose of the horse, and having the horse continually going along after them, but pulling the man in the wagon. But, anyway, even a man who is achieving that wage is—I hate like the mischief to use the term in connection with any worker, even if it be only one—really a sweater. He has to pay his helpers and others. He pays them, not the company. I would like to change that; he is an employer instead of a sweater.

Senator STERLING. I have here a clipping from the North American of the 22d, and this is an article in regard to wages:

The average daily pay of the corporation's employees, including the administration and selling forces, is \$6.23. According to a recent report to the directors this is an increase of 116 per cent since 1914, when that average was \$2.88. The average annual pay in 1918 was \$1,950.

What have you to say as to the truth of that statement?

Mr. GOMPERS. First, that the record will show that the increased profits of the corporation have been 400 per cent since that time.

Senator STERLING. Well, Mr. Gompers—

Mr. GOMPERS. Pardon me, Senator, but will you let me answer your question?

Senator STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. GOMPERS. The question of averages is the most misleading thing that can be presented to any body of men or to any man. It reminds me very much of a cartoon by Thomas Nast, which appeared in the old Harper's Weekly during the Civil War. Near the end of the war, when they were bolstering up the cause of the South, bolstering up the spirit of the men fighting for the Southern cause, a declaration was made by the Confederate officials that the average age of the Confederate Army was 35 years. Thomas Nast drew a cartoon which has ever lived in my mind when averages have been presented. He had a Confederate soldier, ragged, decrepit, and 69 years of age; then he had a cradle on the other side, with a baby 1 year old, with a little toy gun in its hands. He said that was how the average of the age in the Southern Army was reached. The average you speak of is confessedly not only of the employees but also of the selling agents and all others.

Senator STERLING. But there are comparatively few men who receive as much as \$30 per day, I suppose. There was testimony given here yesterday by Mr. Fitzpatrick that some men received as high as \$60 per day. Of course they are comparatively few and that class would not count so much in the average, would they, the men receiving extremely high wages?

Mr. GOMPERS. We can imagine how the mass of workmen can live in these times on 35 or 40 cents an hour, and where there is one man that is receiving \$60 a day, there are 5,000 who are receiving the lower wage to which I have referred.

Senator STERLING. You would not say there had not been an increase?

Mr. GOMPERS. Oh, no, I would not dispute that.

Senator STERLING. I am simply trying to explain the increase in percentage, this increase of 116 per cent over 1914.

Mr. GOMPERS. Accept my assurance that this was not given to the workmen upon a silver platter; and if the term giving something as a sop can be employed at all, that is the thing to which it can be applied.

Senator STERLING. The employees are allowed to become shareholders, are they not, in the company?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes; they are allowed to become shareholders in the company, the same as every citizen of the United States is entitled to become President of the United States, but there is only one elected every four years.

Senator STERLING. Do you know how many shareholders there are among the employees?

Mr. GOMPERS. I do not.

Senator STERLING. I call your attention to a report of the corporation showing that 60,741 employees have become shareholders in the company for which they work. They own 156,680 shares of stock, and the pay to the employees that own that stock ranges from \$3.50

a day for common laborers up to \$30 a day for skilled rollers, in the mills.

Mr. GOMPERS. I won't deny; I won't even doubt the figures given, but there is no question but that the new policy developed by the company, of having a number of workmen take some stock, upon the installment plan, was for no other reason than to tie the men to the job.

Senator STERLING. I thought it more than fair, in this investigation, to call attention to those things. It was just by accident that I found them in the paper last evening.

I want to call attention to another matter. Do you know whether the corporation expends anything for welfare work among its employees?

Mr. GOMPERS. I don't.

Senator STERLING. It expends a considerable sum, does it not?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think so. It can well afford to.

Senator STERLING. Here is a statement referring to bureaus organized for the Steel Corporation for the care of its employees. An official of its bureau of safety, sanitation and welfare recently submitted a report to the directors, in which it was shown that \$12,650,000 was expended in welfare work in 1918.

Mr. GOMPERS. There is no dispute about that. But this is a demonstrated point, no doubt admitted by every employer or company that has introduced this so-called welfare work—in the language of Mr. Patterson, of the National Cash Register Co.—“It pays, it pays.” It pays the company.

Senator STERLING. Undoubtedly it does, and it is a benefit to the employees themselves. It is reciprocal in that respect.

Mr. GOMPERS. What the workmen want is less charity and better wages and better laboring conditions.

Senator STERLING. I suppose you would put under the head of “charity” the pensions which they pay to their old employees wouldn't you?

Mr. GOMPERS. Not only pensions—but the direct purpose to alienate and prevent the workers from thinking in the terms of organizing for self protection and self welfare and mutual welfare.

Senator STERLING. Yes. You think that that is the sole purpose; that it is malevolent rather than benevolent, in all of these activities?

Mr. GOMPERS. There is no doubt of that in my mind—not malevolent. I would not say malevolent; but it is tactful. Welfare work in many industries has been paraphrased by a number of workmen, and particularly the seamen, and they call it hell-fare work.

Senator STERLING. Yes. I call your attention to this:

The pension rolls of the Corporation for 1918 show 2,901 persons in the lists, with payments of more than \$700,000 annually to persons averaging 29 years of service, with an average age of 63 years. The pension fund, including the endowment of \$4,000,000, created by the late Andrew Carnegie in 1901, now amounts to \$12,000,000.

Mr. GOMPERS. The same cart and the same horse and the same purpose.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Gompers, is there another element, along similar lines, resorted to, the payment of bonuses for exceptional service?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think it obtains.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes. Have you any information as to the approximate amount of the annual payments in employment bonuses?

Mr. GOMPERS. I have not those figures in mind, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. I have not either. I think they have been published in some of their annual reports.

Mr. GOMPERS. And let me say in connection with that, Senator, that we do not want bonuses. We want the pay envelopes. That which we get in the pay envelopes determines our lives, not the bonus which is gratuitously given.

Senator PHIPPS. But granting an established wage system for compensation, do you or do you not feel that for some extraordinary service, where a workman has done more than he has been asked to do, where he has earned a stated wage, do you think he should be rewarded by some payment of a bonus, call it a gratuity if you will?

Mr. GOMPERS. Not by a bonus. What the organizations of labor ask is that a minimum wage shall be paid, a minimum wage which shall permit the worker a fair standard of life, conforming to the civilization of our times and of the community in which the worker lives. We do not arbitrarily state or insist that the wages shall be paid according to the understanding or intelligence of employees, but we put it as a minimum, and that any additional wage may be paid as the employer believes the merits of the individual worker or group of workers may deserve. But the term "bonus" in itself is something to which we entirely object.

Senator PHIPPS. You perhaps, however, realize a situation like this: Three or five workmen employed practically at the same bench, performing identical tasks, but there would be a variation in, not perhaps the amount of work actually turned out, but in the character of the work, that you would discourage the recognition of any one workman of the number who had shown himself exceptionally proficient in performing his work?

Mr. GOMPERS. There would be no objection on that score in the payment of a regular wage commensurate with the superior quality of work turned out; but to pay it as a bonus, something evanescent and something that is given as a gratuity in the form of a bonus, that is objectionable, very objectionable.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it not an inducement to the workman to expend his best efforts to do the best he can, rather than to observe the standard of the men who are working beside him as the limit?

Mr. GOMPERS. If it is extra wages and it is stated that it is for superiority of work, there is no objection to that; but if it is given as a bonus, it is objectionable. You will find, for instance, in many trades that there is a certain general standard of a minimum wage. There are individual employers who pay this minimum wage, this standard wage, which is all very good; but they also say, "We propose to pay the men, say, \$1 a day more; this is our minimum; or, for certain classes of labor, we propose to pay \$1 more per day, or 50 cents more per day, as a minimum." You will find that that employer usually attracts to himself those workmen, or a large part of them.

Senator PHIPPS. That may be true; but I was speaking about where the men are employed in exactly the same tasks and at the same rate of pay.

Mr. GOMPERS. There is this in that connection, Senator. It is a favorite pastime of many employers to have someone or a few men who are known in industry as pacemakers. These men have extraordinary physical ability or strength. They have great dexterity. The employer then expects the average man to drive himself beyond his mental and physical powers of endurance to keep up with the pacemaker.

The captains of industry do not yet understand what is meant by the poison of fatigue, and how prevalent it is among the workers in the industries of the United States is not generally known. An honest effort is being made and has been made for the past few years to stop the waste and the destruction of human life by that method of pacemaker, and that principle is involved also in the bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. That question of fatigue is even more important as to women workers?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, much more so, so far as the race is concerned, so far as the people generally are concerned. But so far as it affects the human, it is pretty hard on the man who works so long that his energies give out.

The CHAIRMAN. How is it possible for a man to work 12 hours a day for 365 days a year?

Mr. GOMPERS. He can not do it for a very long time. At one time during a discussion of the hours of labor, I took occasion to say this: that if employers want the best that there is in a man, to get all that there is in him in two or three days, work him 24 hours a day; if they want the best that there is in a man for a period covering eight or ten years, work him 12 or 11 hours a day; but if they want the best that is in a man covering a long period of 20 or 30 years of service and labor, adopt the eight-hour day, and they will find it economically and industrially and socially sound and profitable.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gompers, have you covered what you desire to say, outside of questions of the committee, or are there other matters to take up? I ask you that, because of the adjournment time. If you could finish in a few minutes, we will continue.

Mr. GOMPERS. I can, sir. In 1910, when there was an unusual effort put forward to stamp out and prevent organization among the workers of the United States Steel Corporation (but our efforts were overcome), I prepared and had the assistance of others in preparing a document which was published in pamphlet form and presented to the Hon. George W. Wickersham, then Attorney General of the United States. This pamphlet contained statements and evidence in support of the charge that the United States Steel Corporation had violated not only the laws of the land but the laws of the States in which they were operating. There were included in the statement and evidence the conditions then prevailing, the efforts then being made in reference to the workers trying to organize, trying to hold meetings, trying to exercise the rights of citizens of the United States or of people in the United States who were working.

Senator McKELLAR. Can you put that into the record?

Mr. GOMPERS. I shall be very glad to do so. I should like to point out a few of the general statements.

Senator McKELLAR. We would be very glad if you would do so.

**Mr. GOMPERS.** But, without reading them, I will give the headings of them.

The Intimidation of a Pastor.  
Band men Fined.

Musicians.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Fined for what, the quality of the music or what?

**Mr. GOMPERS.** They held a meeting and sounded a note which was discordant to the ears of the corporation.

Intimidations at Cambridge, Ohio.

Intimidations and assaults at Morgantown, W. Va.

The **CHAIRMAN.** How was the pastor intimidated, Mr. Gompers?

**Mr. GOMPERS.** Mr. Roberts, will you read that for him, please?

**Mr. ROBERTS** (assistant to Mr. Gompers):

September 16, 1909. The speaker at the Apollo labor meeting on this date was the Rev. C. Johnson, a Free Methodist minister, from Leechburg, who consented to address the meeting on the invitation of A. E. Holder, American Federation of Labor organizer.

September 17, 1909. The Rev. Johnson's relations in the Leechburg mills and his church members in the Leechburg and Vandergrift mills were threatened with discharge if the pastor again dared to speak on the labor movement or attend meetings.

**Mr. GOMPERS.** There are several of them here. If you agree, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I shall deliver them to the stenographer, especially pointing them out, and if you will permit, I shall offer the entire document as part of the hearing.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Yes, we will be glad to have it.

(The parts of the pamphlet indicated to the reporter by Mr. Gompers are below reproduced in full as follows):

BY LLEWELLYN LEWIS.

July 9, 1909. Llewellyn Lewis, of Martin's Ferry, Ohio, made affidavit December 29, 1909, that he, with William Hilton, George Evans, also of Martin's Ferry, and George Bender, of Pittsburgh, Pa., on July 9, 1909, tried to persuade some employees of the United States Steel Corporation to form a local organization of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers at North Vandergrift, Pa., and after leaving those employees proceeded peacefully to Vandergrift, Pa., and were there attacked by a mob led by a man named Labonna Steele, and a man named Dunn, both of whom are minor officials of the United States Steel Corporation. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Hilton were seriously assaulted with clubs and knives and the small party was placed on a train, shipped out of town, and warned never to return.

On the same day the organizers, Jenkins and Jonsey, of the United Mine Workers of America, were assaulted by the same mob in Vandergrift for trying to talk with nonunion mine workers.

The following week the organizers secured accommodations at Parks Hotel in Apollo, Pa., a small town about 2 miles from Vandergrift, and the steel corporation's officials coerced the business men of that place to sign a petition calling upon the burgess to force the organizers to leave the town, but the organizers stood their constitutional rights and refused to go. The trust agents then prevented meetings being held in Apollo by coercing owners of halls from renting them to the organizers.

BY ROBERT EDWARDS.

July 22, 1909. Robert Edwards, of Martins Ferry, Ohio, made affidavit December 29, 1909, that while he was engaged distributing circulars among the mill men of Vandergrift on July 22, 1909, he was set upon by a number of men led by one Jack McIntyre and surrounded. He was abused and ordered to leave town on the next train, and was threatened that if he



returned he would be taken out in a box. Edwards, a few days afterwards, went to Apollo, Pa., and rented a vacant lot from a Mr. Cochran. He arranged a meeting for July 31. On July 30, Mr. Cochran asked Mr. Edwards for his receipt, and offered to return the money paid as rent, giving as his reason that if he rented his property for a labor meeting the steel corporation would ruin his business interests in the community. Cochran's request was refused, and the first labor meeting in Apollo in 15 years was held on the Cochran lot, under the protection of John Kennedy, chief of police, who advised the organizers to prepare for trouble. The speaker at this meeting was Mr. Raymond Robins, of Chicago. The meeting was disturbed by agents of the trust, but with no serious violence resulting.

Later the same evening, between 8 and 8.30 o'clock, a mob of several hundred people, led by Oscar Lindquist, superintendent of the Vandegrift mill, crossed the Kiskiminetas River from Westmoreland County, Pa., to Apollo in Armstrong County, Pa., and surrounded Parks' Hotel at Apollo, and demanded that the organizers be turned out of the hotel and delivered up to him. This the proprietor (Mr. T. J. Parks) refused to do, and the organizers stood upon their rights, stayed in the hotel, and refused to go, whereupon Lindquist replied that he was the law in the Kiski Valley, and that he was backed in all his actions by the United States Steel Corporation, and if the organizers did not go he would take them by force, and burn down or otherwise destroy the hotel. A riot seemed imminent. Mr. Lindquist offered Mr. John Kennedy, the chief of police, a sum of money if he would withdraw for a short time. (Note Mr. Kennedy's attest to this affidavit, Exhibit No. 4.)

Mr. Steele, the Burgess of Apollo, accompanied by Mr. A. L. Hammitt, superintendent of the United States Steel Corporation's mill at Saltsburg, Pa., then entered the hotel, and first ordered the organizers to leave, then offered them money, which was refused, and later the Burgess personally prevailed upon the organizers to promise to leave town the next morning, as the crowd under Lindquist was getting beyond his (the Burgess's) control. In order to avert bloodshed and keep the peace, the organizers consented to do this, but in the meantime kept an all-night vigil for their own protection.

This statement, sworn to by Robert Edwards, is also attested by J. D. Pierce, Albert Uncafer, T. J. Parks, proprietor of Parks's Hotel, and John Kennedy, chief of police at Apollo, Pa. (Note exhibits No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4.)

#### INTIMIDATION AND BOYCOTT BY COMPANY.

August 9, 1909. John Carter and other employees of the Vandegrift mills were ordered to quit their jobs or move from Parks's Hotel where the organizers were stopping. The employees changed their boarding house.

Early in August Mr. Uncafer rented the organizers a hall in Apollo, and at the first meeting Mr. Al Johnson, a union molder, who also owned an ice cream parlor, acted as chairman. His customers, who had been largely mill employees from the Vandegrift mill, were immediately ordered to get their ice cream elsewhere. Johnson was compelled to close out his business. The boycott was perfect.

#### BURGLARY AND PREVENTION OF ASSEMBLAGE.

August 26 to September 6, 1909. (Note exhibits No. 3 and No. 8.)

Mr. Robert Edwards rented a vacant room at Leechburg, Pa., from an Italian named John Demyen, paying him \$35 for a month's occupancy and taking receipt therefor. On going to hold a meeting on the evening of September 1 the door was found barred, the notices pulled down from the windows, and the property of the organization thrown in the street. The owner refused to open or allow the room to be occupied, giving as his reason that it would ruin his fruit business; possession of this room was never obtained, but the owner was prosecuted for breaking and entering and held for \$1,000 bond for trial at the county court. That same evening, September 1, an open-air meeting was held at Leechburg because of the impossibility to obtain a hall that night.

On September 2, the city council of Leechburg held a special meeting and passed an ordinance prohibiting the distribution of circulars without permit, and prohibiting all open-air meetings.

September 3, Arthur E. Holder, A. F. of L. organizer, went to Leechburg, and tried to get possession of the room rented by Mr. Edwards, but failed. He

then tried to rent other halls, but was informed by three separate owners that they did not propose to run any risk of offending the United States Steel Corporation. He then made arrangements to hold an open-air meeting on the same corner where the former meeting had been held September 1. This was done without knowledge of the ordinance by the city council the night before. At 7.30 p. m., same day (September 3), Holder was accosted by Mr. S. T. Shoff, chairman of the city council, and Mr. Morris (acting deputy burgess), both of whom were bosses in the company's mill, and informed by them that open-air meetings were prohibited by order of the council the night before. In the meantime, Holder had secured the Odd Fellows' Hall for that night with the prospect of getting the same hall for two weeks from Mr. H. V. Ashbaugh, secretary of Lodge No. 651, I. O. O. F.

Holder asked the city officials for permission to announce to the street gathering where the meeting would be held, but was instantly and imperatively refused, but he made the announcement nevertheless, and the meeting was held in Odd Fellows' Hall that evening without interruption.

It so happened that Mr. Lindquist and other trust officials were members of the lodge that owned the Odd Fellows' Hall in which the labor meeting was held September 3. A special meeting of the Odd Fellows was called for September 4. The tongue lashing given the secretary, Mr. Ashbaugh, for renting the hall to the labor people, is unprintable, but the following letter from him is significant and mildly explanatory. (Note Exhibit No. 5.)

LEECHBURG, PA., September 6, 1909.

MR. A. E. HOLDER, *Appollo, Pa.*

DEAR SIR: When meeting the trustees of the I. O. O. F. Saturday evening I ran up against it badly, but could do nothing in the way of permitting any future labor meetings in the I. O. O. F. Hall, so I suppose this chapter is ended. Very respectfully,

H. V. ASHBAUGH,

*Secretary and Trustee I. O. O. F. No. 651.*

A few days later Mr. Ashbaugh told Mr. Holder that he had fought for human rights for the black man in the Civil War; and it looked as if some one would soon have to fight for ordinary rights for the poor white man.

#### PROCLAMATION BY THE VANDERGRIFT BURGESS.

August 31, 1909. The following proclamation was issued and conspicuously posted in Vandergrift. It is self-explanatory, with this supplement: The burgess who signed it is an understudy in the office of the Vandergrift mill, and knows nothing about legal terms of procedure, yet he dared to exceed arbitrarily the powers not conceded by the Constitution to judge on the bench. (Note Exhibit No. 6.)

#### PROCLAMATION.

After congratulating the people of Vandergrift and the adjoining boroughs on the measure of peace and prosperity which now pervades the community, I know that I voice the sentiment of all good people in saying that we would deplore anything that would mar the peace and harmony which now pervades the entire community, and this is particularly so as regards Vandergrift Borough. It is, therefore, a matter of regret that outside influences seem to be at work, the accomplishment of which would only tend to disturb the peace and order of the Borough of Vandergrift. I refer to marches, parades, meetings, and demonstrations by persons, mostly non-residents, and which could have no other effect than to engender ill-feeling among our citizens and neighbors.

As the corporate officer of the Borough of Vandergrift, Pa., charged with the maintenance of the peace and order of the borough, I can not tolerate or permit any such conditions to exist.

Now, know ye, that I, James H. Chambers, burgess of the Borough of Vandergrift, Pa., by and under authority vested by law, do hereby (until such time as may seem more expedient) forbid the assembling of persons in large crowds upon the streets, alleys, highways, or private properties, and all marches, parades, public meetings, or any other public demonstrations within the

borough limits, and all persons are commanded to follow their usual avocations in their usual quiet way.

Given under my hand and seal this 31st day of August, 1909.

[SEAL.]

JAMES H. CHAMBERS, *Burgess*.

#### BOYCOTT THREATENED.

Following the prohibition of the celebration of Labor Day, the shop committee of the molders employed by the United States Engineering Co. of Vandergrift were approached by their employers and urged to abstain from attending the union meetings because the United States Steel Corporation had threatened to cancel orders for steel castings and rolls if the molders continued to encourage the organizers. Of this the following statement is a verification. (Note Exhibit No. 7. Also note supplement to Exhibit No. 7.)

#### UNION MOLDERS' SIGNED STATEMENT, APOLLO, PA.

December 29, 1909. To whom it may concern: This is to certify that we, the undersigned, do know that the trust officials of the Vandergrift mills not only try to prevent their employees from attending union meetings or associating with union men, but they also requested the management of the United Engineering Co. in Vandergrift to try and prevent their employees from doing the same.

E. COSTIN,  
E. L. HEITCHULL,  
B. N. HULEMAN,  
JAMES GALLAGHER.

#### DIFFICULT TO OBTAIN MEETING HALLS.

The A. F. of L. organizer, A. E. Holder, and Robert Edwards, of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, made persistent endeavors to obtain rooms or halls in which to hold meetings in Vandergrift, Pa., but were unsuccessful. Landlords and agents invariably used this reply: "I should be glad to rent to you, but I do not dare." One man, Mr. S. J. Poole, a painter and decorator, was willing to allow the use of a part of his storeroom, but was prevented by his landlord, who held him to the strict letter of the law on subtenants. Mr. Poole's business suffered severely for his expression of sympathy with the mill employees and his protests against the condition of enforced servitude prevailing in the Vandergrift, Hyde Park, and Leechburg mills of the United States Steel Corporation.

#### DISCHARGED BECAUSE WIVES ATTENDED MEETINGS.

Early in September ladies were invited to attend the labor meetings held at Apollo, and a number did so, among them the wives of Mr. Boyer and Mr. Painter, shearmen at the Hyde Park mill. The boss at the mill advised these men to order their wives to stay away from the meetings and the men demurred. On September 16 both of these men were discharged and abused because their wives attended another meeting (September 14) after they were warned. Mr. Boyer had worked for the company for 14 years and had never before been rebuked. (Note supplement to Exhibit 8.)

#### INTIMIDATION OF A PASTOR.

September 16, 1909. The speaker at the Apollo labor meeting on this date was the Rev. C. Johnson, a Free Methodist minister from Leechburg, who consented to address the meeting on the invitation of A. E. Holder, A. F. of L. organizer.

September 17, 1909. The Rev. Johnson's relations in the Leechburg mills and his church members in the Leechburg and Vandergrift mills were threatened with discharge if the pastor again dared to speak on the labor movement or attend meetings.

#### BAND MEN FINED.

September 25, 1909. A small party of young men, the military band of Vandergrift, rehearsed in a hall on this date, and then marched through the streets, to the baseball park. They were arrested and charged with violation of the

proclamation of the burgess, and fined \$5 each for marching through the streets. It was reported that the fines were remitted, but the men were warned not to repeat the offense again, unless they secured a permit from the burgess.

After this all the mill employees were warned not to walk on the street where the labor hall was located in Apollo, nor under any circumstances converse with or have anything to do with the organizers or other people who attend the meetings.

Individual complaints of the employees in the company's mills as to the restrictions they suffer and the indignities they have to undergo in the mills are really pitiful. (Note Exhibit No. 3 by Pierce, and No. 8, by Holder).

#### INTIMIDATIONS AT CAMBRIDGE, OHIO.

At Cambridge, Ohio, the men employed in the United States Steel mills, after refusing to join the strike (during July and August, 1909), were forbidden by the management to converse with other fellow-employees while at work, as had been their usual custom for years, and were further ordered to stay off the streets and remain at home while not on duty at the mill. This latter order was for the purpose of keeping them from coming into contact with representatives of the Amalgamated Association who were stationed at Cambridge. (Note Exhibit No. 9).

#### INTIMIDATIONS AND ASSAULTS AT MORGANTOWN, W. VA.

July 10, 1909. Mr. Emmet Flood, A. F. of L. organizer, was sent to Morgantown, W. Va., to endeavor to organize the employees of the United States Steel Corporation in the "Sabraton" mill. He registered at the Stoker Hotel, and inquired for two representatives of the Amalgamated Association, and was informed by the proprietor that the chief of police, Mr. George L. Grubb, and the superintendent of the Sabraton mill had ordered them to leave town.

July 11, 1909. Mr. Flood met Mr. Daniel Isaacs, one of the Amalgamated Association men, and found him much alarmed at the situation. Mr. Isaacs was recalled from Morgantown, and was relieved by Mr. Eliab Reese, who was advised by the superintendent of the mill to leave town, which he did soon afterwards.

July 12, 1909. The chief of police, Mr. Grubb, in full uniform, visited Mr. Flood at the hotel to inquire the nature of his business, and then told him that the United States Corporation, through its superintendent, objected to his presence in Morgantown, and asked the chief to request him (Flood) to leave town at once. Mr. Flood refused to go.

July 13, 1909. Messrs. Thomas O. Jones and William H. Francis, representing the amalgamated association, arrived in Morgantown on this date. The same day the chief of police made a second call at the hotel, and stated that he was instructed by Mayor Layton to order them to leave town at once, or the mayor and chief of police would not be responsible for what might happen to them. The chief was asked if it was the intent of the company to use mob violence. He replied that "the managers of the Sabraton mill were determined that the organizers should leave the city. Mr. Flood then demanded that the chief of police protect him as a citizen. The chief said: "I will, but if matters get beyond my control those higher in authority will be responsible for what happens."

Threats were made to the organizers by other men on the same day, and they stated that they were hired by the superintendent of the plant to slug the organizers.

July 14, 1909. Thomas O. Jones was assaulted in the most public part of the main street and left for dead, and the last man he remembers seeing before being struck was the chief of police. On the same date Mr. Flood informed the chief of police that he and the mayor were responsible for the assault on Jones; that they not only allowed the man committing the assault to escape, but that the chief had warned them of what might happen, and then allowed the assault to take place without giving them the protection to which any citizen was entitled.

It was impossible during the stay of the organizers in Morgantown to rent a hall of any kind where regular meetings might be held. On one occasion a hall was secured, but the meeting was not held. An effort was made to rent the same hall, but the owner refused to rent it. (Note Exhibits Nos. 10 and 11.)

A full and detailed account of these incidents in the form of original affidavits and exhibits will be available at the demand or call of the department.

#### ABUSES IN THE TOWN OF GARY.

The more recent phases of the trust methods in the town of Gary, Ind., could be well summarized by saying that all that is complained of in the foregoing epitome has been practiced in more or less intensified forms in Gary, as the following will show:

The United States Steel Corporation, by virtue of Indiana statutes, was compelled to incorporate numerous small companies, with certain restricted and specific duties vested in each corporation, to carry out the ultimate purpose of the United States Steel Corporation within said State. Among the methods adopted was to have a separate corporation called the Indiana Steel Co., with corporate powers, to manufacture steel and iron and their by-products.

Another corporation, known as the Gary Land Co., which is exercising the franchise of owning town sites, has the power of erecting residences, business blocks, banks, hotels, saloons, and eating houses; in fact, operating all the functions of an ordinary municipal government, with the powers of a private corporation and a private individual, to provide for everything incident to the private life of a citizen in the way of drainage, sewerage, light, heat, and property ownership.

The gas company is organized under a separate charter, and the water company by another separate charter.

This aggregation of separate State corporations advertises in their prospectuses and in their confidential reports to stockholders that they are subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation.

Aside from the municipal functions above described, the lake transportation and the rail transportation are under separate corporations, and these in turn are advertised as being subsidiary to the United States Steel Corporation by a stock and bond ownership. The resultant effect of this monopoly of even all the habitations, enables the company to import and to hold under a species of practical peonage, Slavs, Hungarians, Italians, Servians, Poles, and Turks. And this class of laborers, whether made citizens or left as foreigners, is herded together, in some instances as many as 15 or 16 in a room, bringing with them all the degradation, filth, and lack of civilization that are incident to the lowest stratum of their respective nations. With no chance to be reached or influenced by American workers, or by the organizations of American labor, they have no opportunity to get the benefit and strength of associations of laborers to lift their condition. They are subjected to the private police supervision of this corporation with all its power of wealth and avarice. To illustrate: There are five uniformed and armed guards or policemen at every entrance and exit to the yards. No friend or foe can pass the guard without surveillance equivalent to that of the Russian Cossack or the French gendarme. The corporation enforces a 12-hour day, seven days a week, having two shifts in the 24 hours, which offers the employes no opportunities for the duties of citizenship or for acquiring information necessary to become intelligent citizens or to assimilate themselves with our American people, and American institutions.

Among the sociological phenomena to be observed is the fact that the Corporation has hired a physician and erected a hospital. This physician is in charge as surgeon of the hospital and morgue combined. He takes care of the Corporation's injured and slain. It is so arranged that the moment an accident befalls one of these foreigners, whether through his own fault or that of others, he is isolated from his friends, from the courts, and from legal advice, and if he emerges from the hospital alive he is confronted in almost every instance with ironclad written rules, foisted on him while under to surgeon's care, relinquishing his rights to the use of the statutes and Federal courts, foregoing his right to have counsel. If the injured man dies no information is permitted to or is obtainable by his administrator or other friends interested in his death, often the result of the negligence or brutal indifference of the Corporation.

One of the suggested dangers of this method of espionage and practical peonage is that a man who would be independent enough, if such could be conceived, to want his rights protected where the injury inflicted was the fault of the employer, might come to a fatal end, which otherwise his private physician might have prevented. No man in this country should be precluded from the

use and opportunity of the use of our forms of government in determining who should be his doctor or his nurse, what court should adjudicate his wrongs, what school teach his children, and who should be his administrator in death. It is the pride of the American Federation of Labor that we have in many thousands of cases performed the almost hopeless task of accepting the rawest material of humanity conceivable from all climes, all nations, all religions, and molding from it self-respecting, self-sustaining, independent American citizens.

The monopolistic treatment of labor by the United States Steel corporation is resulting in the degradation of the individual, making him a serf, servile, and depriving his children and family of the advantages of our form of Government.

Among the pernicious oppressions to which we call the department's attention is the so-called municipal government that the said corporation has been enabled to establish. It charges arbitrary trust prices for gas, arbitrary prices for the rental of eating houses. The managers reserve advantageous business corners, to rent as barrooms, which they keep under their own control to the extent of being landlords thereof, prohibiting the right of liquor selling to others. The corporation destroys absolutely all opportunity for its employees to organize for the protection or promotion of their rights and interests. The wages paid the employees is the minimum of that prevailing in any similar labor; a day of 12 hours' labor is enforced, while workmen laboring in Gary for other employers are receiving an average wage of 50 cents an hour for eight hours. Among these workers are carpenters, bricklayers, and stonemasons. The wage is a relative term when it is considered that the price asked of the employers for their rents, water and gas, without meter inspection, and subject to other impositions, are monopolistic. We will be glad to furnish you any detail if it is desirable for you to enter into this phase of the matter.

We might call attention to the intercorporate system or scheme whereby alleged individual corporations or separate corporations each collect for the other their respective dues. This monopolistic plant has also for its employees the gas consumers, water consumers, the renters, the consumers of beer, the borrowers at the bank, or insurers in its industrial company. Therefore all subsidiary corporations can have their respective dues deducted in advance, or at least before the wages are turned over, through the pay envelope. The pay envelope becomes the clearing house for all monopolistic charges of these subordinate, subsidiary corporations—the United States Steel Corporation owning all of these companies through common stock ownership.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gompers, before you close, would you mind telling us what is the general situation in the country as to labor unrest, etc.?

Mr. GOMPERS. I shall be very glad to, but you must abandon your suggestion of closing your session in a few minutes, Mr. Chairman. I will be as brief as I can in trying to answer the question asked.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I can do no better service to the committee than to offer as a part of my statement an article which I wrote for McClure's Magazine for April, 1919, only about five months ago. Its title is, "Our Shield Against Bolshevism." If permitted, I shall be very glad to offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have it.

Mr. GOMPERS. I think you will find this spring poem rather interesting. It is prose, not poetry.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

OUR SHIELD AGAINST BOLSHIEVISM.

[By Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor.]

America is not merely a name, a land, a country, a continent; America is a symbol. It is an ideal, the hope of the world.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand by his country in times of stress and war as well as during times of peace. The man who would not fight, or make the supreme sacrifice, if necessary, to save and protect his home and his country, who would not fight for liberty, is undeserving and unworthy of living in a free country.

American organized workers have always endeavored to promote good will among the peoples of the world. The possibility of war has ever been regarded by them as the black shadow of an indescribable catastrophe. The interests of the workers are identified with those of peace. War has never meant to them opportunity for gain or exploitation. It has always meant to them privation, direct suffering, service on the firing-line and in the actual fighting of the war, and bearing the burdens that follow in its wake. The workers abhor war with all its frightfulness, horror, bloodshed and mangled flesh, but they realize that there are greater evils than war. Peace secured through the surrender of a principle vital to liberty, justice and democracy is nothing less than coward servility.

The American labor movement never advocated peace at any price. It never encouraged nor gave support to any movement of peace at any price. While it recognizes that peace is essential for normal, progressive development, it steadfastly refused to advocate peace at the sacrifice of the ideals of freedom and justice.

Despite the fact that there are within the membership of the American Federation of Labor men of all nationalities, yet on March 12, 1917, nearly a month prior to the declaration of war on the part of our Government, the representatives of the national and international unions of America met in solemn conference and there conceived the position which the workers of America should take, whether we would be permitted to enjoy the priceless privilege of peace or whether we would be thrust or dragged into the maelstrom of war. At that conference certain fundamental principles were laid down. Among them were—

1. That the standards of living of the American people should be maintained or improved and not deteriorated; and

2. That the rights and liberties of the people of the United States should be maintained and secured whether in peace or in war.

We then unanimously declared:

"We, the officers of the National and International Trade Unions of America in national conference assembled in the capital of our nation, hereby pledge ourselves in peace or in war, in stress or in storm, to stand unreservedly by the standards of liberty and the safety and preservation of the institutions and ideals of our Republic.

"In this solemn hour of our Nation's life, it is our earnest hope that our Republic may be safeguarded in its unswerving desire for peace; that our people may be spared the horrors and the burdens of war; that they may have the opportunity to cultivate and develop the arts of peace, human brotherhood and a higher civilization.

"But despite all our endeavors and hopes, should our country be drawn into the maelstrom of the European conflict, we, with these ideals of liberty and justice herein declared, as the indispensable basis for national policies, offer our services to our country in every field of activity to defend, safeguard, and preserve the Republic of the United States of America against its enemies, whosoever they may be, and we call upon our fellow workers and fellow citizens in the holy name of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity to devotedly and patriotically give like service."

Though distantly removed from one another, our soldiers, sailors, and workers were united into one solid phalanx in the great contest between democracy and autocracy to decide the right of peoples to govern themselves, or the

might and powers of kings and emperors to rule and dominate their subjects. With unceasing endeavor and to the utmost of their superb powers, they answered every call that was made upon them. American labor realized that upon the armies on the battlefield, supported by our mighty industrial army at home, rested the burden of freeing the world from the menace of enslavement that autocratic rulers sought to fasten upon the peoples of all the world. America's workers played a mighty and majestic part in the winning of the Great War.

Labor proved the Government's greatest asset in insuring victory. The American Federation of Labor assumed proportions of a vast machine in the interests of our Nation and its cause. It minimized in its inception the movement which was intended to create pacifism in the ranks of labor. It rendered ineffective influences which aimed to weaken the forces of our Government.

American labor has kept its trust with democracy and the principles of liberty and justice. It yields to no person or institution in its fidelity and devotion to our Republic. American labor is proud that fewer conscientious objectors were found in its ranks than among any other group of people.

Comparison between the pronouncements and activities of individuals and associations who without warrant or authority assume to speak in the name of labor, and the loyal attitude and patriotic declarations and accomplishments of the organized labor movement as represented by the American Federation of Labor, is vivid. I invite careful reading of the paragraphs quoted above from "American Labor's Position in Peace or in War" of March 12, 1917, and the following declaration of the American Socialist Party:

"The American people did not want and do not want this war. They have not been consulted about the war and have had no part in declaring war. They have been plunged into this war by the trickery and treachery of the ruling class of the country through its representatives in the national administration and National Congress, its demagogic agitators, its subsidized press, and other servile instruments of public expression.

"We brand the declaration of war by our Government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world.

"In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage.

"No greater dishonor has ever been forced upon a people than that which the capitalist class is forcing upon this Nation against its will."

No other influence in our country was viewed with such favor by the autocratic Governments of Germany and Austria as was the pernicious propaganda of the Socialists to destroy or weaken the forces of democracy in this great struggle.

While the greatest of all wars has ended, our work is not yet completed. Peace has come, not technically, but to all intents and purposes. The Imperial Governments of Austria and Germany are no more. The peace conference is meeting in France. Of course, we are all interested in territorial readjustments and the right of small nations to the opportunity to live their own lives and to work out their own destinies. We are all concerned as to what shall be written into the peace treaty, especially in so far as it affects our own people.

We concentrated all our efforts during the war and fought for the principles of our country and the ideals of justice and freedom; we threw the weight of our physical force, our wealth and our spirit into the balance. We have won, and it is good for all to understand that we should be alert and vigilant to see to it that the sacrifices we made to win the war shall not be lost around the peace table.

The affairs of the whole world are in the process of remaking. Relations between nation and nation, and between the peoples within the various nations, and among working people particularly, are undergoing a new change and a new life.

I stand in so far as I can and dare—and I dare much—for the principles of natural and rational development and growth.

I am opposed, as is organized labor of America, to any destructive policy.

There is nothing that is worth while maintaining that I would aid or abet in destroying.

Our policy, our work, our method, our ideas, and our ideals are to build, to construct, to grow, to help in the development of the highest and best in the human family; to make to-day a better day than yesterday, to make to-morrow a better day than to-day, to make to-morrow and to-morrow's tomorrow each a better day than the one that has gone before. That evolutionary process of



progress and improvement is the basis for the opportunity for freedom, justice, and democracy.

That is the constructive policy of progress. If that policy of the American labor movement is opposed, and successfully opposed, then our work, our activities, and our movement will be sent to destruction.

If we are impotent, if we are incapable of securing for the workers improvements in their conditions, then we ought not to exist. I say for myself that if I were convinced that the American labor movement is impotent to be of service to my fellows, I would quit it and abandon the organization to its justifiable fate.

It is a question of dealing with such a movement as represented by the American trade unions—the American Federation of Labor—or dealing with a body of irresponsibles or irreconcilables. If we are not on the right track, then those who represent the wildest orgy of destruction with no consideration for the rights of individuals, will come to the front. It is a matter of choice between dealing with such elements or dealing with the constructive forces of the organized labor movement of our country.

I do not know that I am entitled to very great credit because I am not a Bolshevik. With my understanding of American institutions and American opportunities, I repeat that the man who would not be a patriot in defense of the institutions of our country would be undeserving the privilege of living in this country.

It is true that we have discussed democracy. We have used that term glibly and often without understanding. It is true that we have discussed freedom, and often without understanding. I have had the opportunity of travel in Germany. I have never heard any people so vociferously and enthusiastically sing and shout the terms of freedom and democracy as did the German people.

Freedom is not a condition, nor is democracy a condition. Freedom is the exercise, the functioning of freedom, the practice of freedom, the practice of democracy. All that society can give, all that government can give, is the opportunity for freedom. It depends upon the people to be intelligent and grow into the feeling, the exercise and practice of the function of freedom. It was because the principles of freedom and democracy were menaced by the system of autocracy and militarism that the people of our country and the peoples of other countries and of the democracies of the world rallied around their banners and declared, and made good their willingness to make the supreme sacrifice, for the principles, the institutions and the practice of freedom which were threatened to be overwhelmed and crushed.

If I thought that Bolshevism was the right road to go, that it meant freedom, justice and the principles of humane society and living conditions, I would join the Bolsheviks. It is because I know that the whole scheme leads to nowhere, that it is destructive in its efforts and in its every activity, that it compels reaction and brings about a situation worse than the one it has undertaken to displace, that I oppose and fight it.

The American labor movement is founded upon the historic development of conditions of industry and commerce in our country, based upon the ideas and the ideals of American institutions; it is a movement that is rational, natural, orderly, and yet insistent that the rights to which the workers are entitled shall be fully accorded.

The American labor movement as represented by the American Federation of Labor and our trade-unions is this:

We believe in progress; we believe that all the fruits and the results of the genius of past ages and of to-day do not belong to any particular class; that they belong in truth as a fair share, and opportunity for a fair share, to every man and woman who gives service to society and who aids civilization.

If society stands like a stone wall against that concept, as a united body against that presentation of thought and ideals, no one knows with what we may have to contend later.

The workers of America made many sacrifices during the war. Many of our employers and financiers reaped enormous profits out of the war. There are some lessons which this war has taught.

Readjustment and reconstruction confront all nations. Labor faces these problems calmly and confidently, ready to give service for the good of all our people and our Republic; firm in the conviction that good will, justice, freedom, and democracy will finally prevail throughout the world.

Mr. GOMPERS. Another article in McClures for May, 1919, under the caption, "The battle line of labor—How the American Federation of Labor seeks the safety of the world."

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have that, Mr. Gompers. (The article referred to is as follows:)

THE BATTLE LINE OF LABOR—HOW THE AMERICAN FEDERATION SEEKS THE SAFETY OF THE WORLD.

[By Samuel Gompers.]

American labor's loyalty to the fundamental principles of American democracy stands proven to the world in a record made by months of trial by fire. A loyalty so proven in such a test may be guaranteed to stand through the comparative calm of peace.

The loyalty of American labor during the war was a matter of world interest, a matter commented upon in all circles wherever men met over the world to discuss the fate of civilization and how best to protect its institutions against devastation at the hands of the enemy arms.

This loyalty was inherent in American labor. American labor lives close to the heart of the things that go to make the material side of what we speak of as democracy. Living thus close to the hard facts of it they understand the soul of it and breathe in communion with the very life of it. American labor is of the very stuff of democracy, because the life of the movement is close to the work of democracy, held there constantly by the paramount fact that work and body and soul are inseparable phases of the same life.

The American labor movement had never for a moment a single doubt as to what its course would be, where its heart was and where its duty led when the test came between democracy and autocracy. If the American labor movement had not been purely a movement of work—a movement having to do with the basic facts of life, this might not have been the case. If the American labor movement had been a movement of theory instead of a movement built upon and around work, there might have been a different story written into the record. If the American labor movement had been burdened with even an appreciable segment of detached theoretical leadership, there might have been a vastly different chapter. This is not said in condemnation of theory, but it is said in condemnation of theory which refuses to permit amendment from day to day so as to produce accord with the circumstances of the day.

Because the condition in the American labor movement is what it is, American organized labor stands to-day where it stood during the days of armed conflict, the great protector of true democracy, the keeper of the unceasing vigil of the citadels of right and justice and freedom.

And freedom to American labor is not something abstract. It is not merely a word for platform use. It is not a work of decorative rhetorical art. Freedom for American labor has no meaning until it is translated into terms of life—until it means an avenue to better, fuller, richer, nobler life; until it means opportunity for all to go on to the finest heights of human development, opportunity in such form as to beckon all to the upward path.

American labor believes that America means freedom of that immediate, livable, understandable kind. To American labor the name America means the best of America, the noblest, the truest, the kindest, the bravest, the freest—all the rest must come up to that to become a part of what labor means when it proudly salutes as the Flag goes by. For that the good fight was made on Flanders field, at Chateau Thierry, at St. Mihiel, and in the Argonne. For that men stripped to the waist in the foundries and froze in the shipyards until the foe gave up in ignominious defeat. For that American labor proposes to go on struggling. For that American labor proposes to go on fighting the good fight, whether it be at the peace table in Paris or in the coal fields of Ohio.

There are those who think that anything that exists in American life can be set forth bearing the label "America" and command the loyalty and devotion of American labor. This, of course, is not the case. American labor is the unrelenting foe of every institution everywhere that makes for oppression and unfreedom and the lowering of the standard of life for men and women.

The facts of history have written the record out of which these statements are made. Standing upon that record we look into the future.

Our course will not be different from what it has been in the past. The war did not compel us to make any change in our course. What the war did

was to lay before us the necessity of putting our every ounce of strength and energy into the work of safeguarding what we had so long striven for. Our movement went on in the same direction. The war opened before us as a majestic, climatic episode on the road to the fulfillment of a great historic mission.

There were those—and in large numbers—who disagreed with us before the war. They cast stones at our heads and mocked the sincerity of our hearts. But in the great test our movement was the very fabric of our national life. The labor movement was an organized force doing the work of the war, holding steady and true the creative and productive forces without which there could have been no victory.

Many there were who came to us and avowed agreement with our purposes. We had not changed in our purpose. They had either changed in theirs or they had come to see ours in its true light. The war removed much skepticism.

We have not done with being tested. Life is a continuous test for all things human. But just ahead of us lies a testing that will be scarcely less severe than that through which we went in the grinding mouths of war. Little is as it was before the great fires swept over the earth. We must build anew. In the building we shall build better or we shall build worse. Better to say we shall build wisely, or we shall destroy.

The movement of destruction is abroad in the world to-day. The philosophy of despair has its fanatic adherents. The lean body has furnished many a weak mind as prey to teachings of reaction masked under a pretense of progress. Those who see wisely into the future must, if society is to be saved from fires more consuming than those we have known, so shape the course of the world as to offer this hideous wraith of destruction no foothold. The lean body has a right to the opportunity to get food. If it is denied that right it is fair sport for the teacher of ruin. If it is denied that fundamental right it will sooner or later furnish a weak mind likely to fall prey to whatsoever may come promising relief, no matter how unsound or impossible may be that promise.

Russia stands before our gaze like a flaming torch of warning. A thing called Bolshevism has reared its ugly head in that sad and sorry land. Bolshevism is a theory, the chief tenet of which is the "dictatorship of the proletariat." Leaving out of consideration for the moment the story of murder and devastation that has marched with this theory into practice, we must set down the theory itself as abhorrent to a world that loves democracy. We shall progress by the use of the machinery of democracy, or we shall not progress. There is no group of men on earth fit to dictate to the rest of the world. It is this central idea of Bolshevism that makes the whole of it outcast in the minds of sane men. It is this focusing point of it all that makes it an enemy to our civilization.

This idea—the central theory of Bolshevism—is not in the minds of the people of Russia. This we know as surely as we know any fact that comes to us through human channels. But this theory has been imposed upon a mass in which there is acute hunger, in which there is disorganization, in which there is no strong, normal soul or body left to combat evil immediately and effectively.

Were there an American Federation of Labor in Russia there could have been no Bolshevism. Were there no organized labor movement in America devoted to the ideals of liberty and right and justice and unshaken in its faith in progress through the orderly processes of democracy, there would be Bolshevism in America. If there should be in America any great denial of the just aspirations of the working people, as voiced by their organized movement, there would be a dangerous flow toward Bolshevism that would be neither pleasant nor helpful for America.

There is a tendency in the world to-day to say that everything of a forward-looking nature with which one disagrees is Bolshevism. It has become almost a habit to use that term loosely. But there is a just ambition for a higher standard of life and living that is not Bolshevism and that will not be denied, except at the imminent peril of those who deny, if they prove themselves strong enough to deny with compelling force. The safety of the world to-day—and I say that as one who loves with deep passion the institutions of our own nation and of all democratic peoples—lies in an orderly advancement toward better lives for working people everywhere.

We can not and do not overlook the fact that there is in the world to-day a great deficit in the supply of things. There is a void where there used to be plenty. We must fill that void with things that go to make life as we know it. But we must try our best to fill that void in such a way that what we put into it will actually mean life for the people and not a surplus for the fortunate few.

In our ability to do this will lie much of the safety of our institutions in the immediate future, and much of our chances to realize over the long stretches of time ahead the highest of the ideals with which the whole world has become imbued through our struggle to save the civilization we have built with so much sacrifice and pain.

To tear down is easy. Mere physical strength is required. Samson pulled down a great temple by the effort of his arms. To build a temple requires great labor and skill. There is no shortage of those who know how to pull down the temple to-day. Those who build can prevent destruction by building so well as to defy destruction.

When we emerged from the war there were men who, perhaps unthinkingly, set up cries in our country for the reduction of wages. They saw only one thing—reduction of production costs. They did not see the whole world problem as an entity. They saw their corner of it—and they spoke quickly.

Whatever may have been their intent, their action, if it were permitted to become action, would furnish the richest food Bolshevism could ask for in America. The world was not saved for misery, but for light and life. Reduction of wages has never led a people toward light and life. Always it has led toward panic and hunger and ill-considered action.

We have come forward toward light and life through such measures as the Clayton law, which provides that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce; and the seamen's law, which makes the seaman free from the bondage of earlier days. We have succeeded in establishing a concept in law and in administration that the welfare of the workers is a matter of paramount interest. In this direction we must go, for this direction is forward and any other must be backward. American labor does not necessarily ask for more law. Our movement has never sought a wealth of law; it has asked only such law as is needed to clear path to the progress. The great task has been to secure the removal of law that blocked that path.

The field is littered with the whitened bones of those who have gone seeking salvation through laws. This the American labor movement has recognized, and there is no immediate danger that this philosophy will be deserted in favor of whims and caprices of similar portent. In the realm of political life there is always present the great personal necessity for remaining in political life. In the realm of industry there is only the necessity of going forward with the tasks and battles of industrial life, out of which we can not emerge even if we should wish to.

The facts are inescapable—the battles must be fought where they are. Industry is real—as real as tools and iron and coal and wheat. Men can lay their hands to the things of industry and get the feel of them. There is definiteness in industry, a great, all-enveloping, all-enfolding definiteness that comes as natural to mankind as life itself, because he goes through life by the feel of these things of industry.

There is nothing fixed and definite in the realm of abstraction—in the realm of politics. It lends itself to a false understanding of things that are real. When men depart from the fundamental productive process of the life of the world, there is no power on earth that can guarantee the accuracy of the course they still pursue. Look back upon the record of falsity made by these movements of abstraction in the war. Against such error the American labor movement, in its loyalty to the cause of mankind, sets its face and must continue to set its face.

There is no better indication of the great understanding that is in the mind of American labor to which I can call attention now than the ringing declaration of the American Federation of Labor uttered at the close of America's first year in the war. It will live in history, because it possesses and expresses truth and the profound conviction of a great movement of men and women. Here is set forth what we believed then and what we believe now—our standards of faith and conduct then and now and to-morrow:

"Workers of America, the safety of that battle line in France depends mainly now upon us. We must furnish the majority of those in the trenches. We must build the ships that carry the troops and munitions of war. Regardless of hidden dangers we must maintain the life line of ships on the high seas which connect the fighting front with our national bases of supplies. We must make the guns, the munitions, the airplanes. We must have ready food, clothing, blankets. We serve in the great industrial army that serves overseas with the fighting forces.

"We must do all these things because a principle is involved that has to do with all we hold dear.

"We are fighting against a government that disregards the will of the governed—a government that pries into intimate relations of life and extends its supervision into smallest details and dominates all of them. We are fighting against involuntary labor—against the enslavement of women and the mutilation of the lives and bodies of little children. We are fighting against barbarous practices of warring upon civilian populations, killing the wounded, the agents of mercy, and those who bear the white flag of truce.

"We are fighting for the ideal which is America—equal opportunity for all. We are fighting for political and economic freedom—national and international.

"We are fighting for the right to join together freely in trade-unions and the freedom and the advantages represented by that right.

"Our country is now facing a crisis to meet which continuity of war production is essential. Workers, decide every industrial question fully mindful of those men—fellow Americans—who are on the battle line, facing the enemies' guns, needing munitions of war to fight the battle for those of us back at home, doing work necessary but less hazardous. No strike ought to be inaugurated that can not be justified to the men facing momentary death. A strike during the war is not justified unless principles are involved equally fundamental as those for which fellow citizens have offered their lives—their all.

"We must give this service without reserve until the war is won, serving the cause of human freedom. Intelligent, alert, uncompromising wherever and whenever the principle of human freedom is involved.

"We are in a great revolutionary period which we are shaping by molding everyday relations between man and man. Workers of America as well as all other citizens have difficult tasks to perform that we might hand on to the future the ideals and institutions of America not only unimpaired, but strengthened and purified in spirit and expression—thus performing the responsible duty of those intrusted with the high resolve to be free and perpetuate freedom."

Mr. GOMPERS. Mr. Chairman, there is another article I wrote for the magazine, the *World's Work*, entitled, "The Thing Called Bolshevism."

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have that too.

Mr. GOMPERS. I want to correct that. I mean this: The article, "The Thing Called Bolshevism," was published in the *World's Work*. While in Europe I read it. I cabled over to my office that it might be republished in the *American Federationist*, the official journal of the American Federation of Labor. It is most interesting. If I had not thought so, I would not have directed that it be republished. The three articles will give fairly well the situation as it has been and which up almost to this time has not materially changed, except that the American Federation of Labor has stood squarely against that thing called Bolshevism, in Russia, or in any other country, our own country included.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

#### THE THING CALLED BOLSHEVISM.

THE NEW AUTOCRACY THAT CONTROLS RUSSIA—A REPUBLIC IN WHICH THE POOREST WORKING CLASSES ONLY CAN VOTE AND BEAR ARMS—ITS REFUSAL TO PERMIT THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE TO DETERMINE THEIR OWN FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

A year ago only one apparent force was opposing the Anglo-Saxon idol of a democratic world. This was autocracy as embodied in the Central Empires. It was generally believed that the military defeat of Germany and her Allies would remove the last obstructions to the reorganization of Europe on democratic lines. Hardly has that task been accomplished, however, when a new peril appears. The world does not yet completely understand that the thing now generally known as Bolshevism is really merely another name for autocracy. The simple fact that the leaders have long records as revolutionists, and that the rank and file is composed largely of the working classes, obscures this all-important truth. Yet Lenin is as great an enemy of democracy as the

Czar whom his followers murdered, and Trotzky is as great a danger to liberty as Hindenburg and Ludendorff. One tyranny has disappeared with the collapse of Kaiserism, but another, even more terrible and more unscrupulous, has reared its head. The fact that the enemies of Nicholas Lenin already refer to him as Nicholas III—the recently murdered Czar was Nicholas II—shows that the intimate relation between the new autocracy and the old is bitterly appreciated.

The word Bolshevism, which has suddenly spread all over the world, is not so new as most newspaper readers believe. It has been part of the speech of the Russian Empire for 15 years. Its history is briefly told. It had its beginnings in 1898, when a certain segment of the revolutionary forces in Russia split off and organized the Social Democratic Party. This party differed little in its teachings and its program from the Socialist parties of Germany, France and other countries. It was based frankly upon the principles of Marxian Socialism, and the usual tenets of Socialism, the nationalization of land, industry, transportation, and the like, formed the basis of the new Russia which it aspired to rear on the ruins of the Russian autocracy. The Marxian phrase which these reformers constantly rolled under their tongues, "the dictatorship of the proletariat," sufficiently indicates the nondemocratic character of their program. By the "proletariat"—the Latin word literally means "child-producer"—was meant the poorest element among the city working classes, the men who have no property and no available capital except their hands. The Social Democratic doctrine proposed that these classes, in view of their theory that they were the sole creators of wealth, should exclusively control all political power. Only these men and women should vote, these alone should have the right to hold office, to serve in the army and navy, or should be recognized as actual members of the state. The proposed program did not even admit the peasantry, at least in the early stages of reorganization—this in face of the fact that 86 per cent of the Russian people are tillers of the soil. That the whole movement was a class movement, that it proposed to exclude all professional classes, all "bourgeoisie," all employers, everybody except those who worked with their hands, was the fact upon which the leaders insisted. If we should exclude from the government of New York City all the bankers, lawyers, professors, writers, journalists, and business men, large and small, and center political power exclusively in the hands of the garment workers of the East Side, we should have something that would approximate the new political organization which these extremists had planned.

In 1903, at the second congress of the Social Democratic Party, the organization split into two parties. The differences at first turned merely upon questions of party tactics, but as time went on and the breach became wider, differences of policy became pronounced. These two factions were called the "Mensheviks" and the "Bolsheviks." In Russian these words mean nothing more startling than the "minority" and the "majority." As time went on, however, these words gradually took a new meaning. The fact that the "Mensheviks" advocated a more moderate program and that the "Bolsheviks" grew more and more extreme in their political ideas had the effect of giving these terms the significance which now generally attaches to them. A "Menshevik" is now a moderate revolutionist, a "Bolshevik" is a "whole hogger," who is determined to obtain the earthly paradise instantaneously.

The leader of the "Mensheviks" was George Plekhanof, a Russian nobleman who had led revolutionary movements for 30 years, a scholar of great erudition and culture, a writer of many pamphlets, and a man who had devoted all his energies to the emancipation of the working classes. The leader of the "Bolsheviks"—in 1903, as now—was Nicholas Lenin, also a man of noble birth, a forceful writer and an eloquent speaker, and a man who, whatever the world may think of him now, had shown his devotion to the cause by suffering terribly for it in Russian prisons and in Siberia. Plekhanof, though regarded in Russia as the greatest exponent of the Marxian doctrine, has always advocated a rational and even opportunist policy.

He taught that all Socialists should take part in public affairs, and participate at elections, throwing their influence on the side of the forces that stood for liberalism. He regarded the Czarist régime as the one great evil thing that must be destroyed first of all, and he, therefore, supported any influences that would help to strike it down. Lenin on the other hand refused to compromise and adopt a middle policy; in his eyes the capitalist class, the "bourgeoisie," was just as evil as the Czarism, and he had no use for a revolution that threw out one and supplanted it with the other. The constructive policy

of the "Menshevik" and the annihilating policy of the "Bolshevik" was well brought out by the revolution of 1905. The failures and dishonesty of the Russian autocracy in the Japanese war produced a state of public opinion that might easily have forced the abdication of the Czar at that time. Had all the revolutionary forces joined hands, Russia would have attained a liberal government—perhaps a constitutional monarchy, possibly a democratic republic. Plekhanof and the "Mensheviks" advocated such cooperation, and the establishment of a constitutional system as one step toward the realization of the socialistic state. But Lenin and the "Bolsheviks" destroyed the revolution of 1905, just as they afterwards destroyed that of 1917. They ridiculed the movement as "bourgeois," and refused to take part in the elections to the Dume. Thus the Russian autocracy triumphed in 1905, simply because its enemies were divided, and the one man who did most to wreck the democratic movement at that time was none other than the same marplot—Nicholas Lenin—who, after the Constitutionalist had triumphed in 1917, stole back to Russia by way of Germany, collected his Bolsheviks in Petrograd and Moscow and once more proceeded to destroy the popular movement.

In their attitudes toward the war Plekhanof and Lenin showed these same qualities. From the beginning Plekhanof supported the allied cause because he saw that the real issue was democracy versus autocracy, and because he believed that the destruction of the Central Empires was an essential preliminary to establishing the socialistic régime. Lenin and the Bolsheviks, however, from the first denounced it as a "bourgeois war," merely a struggle between the capitalist classes in the two sets of countries. Whoever won, he asserted, the proletariat were destined to lose and come out of the conflict greater slaves than ever before. The abrupt ending of the war, in his view, no matter what the terms of peace, would benefit the working classes in all countries. As soon as the Czarism was overthrown, therefore, Lenin and his followers began to agitate against the forces of the revolution, forces which, in their estimation, were "bourgeois," "capitalistic," and, therefore, just as evil, if not more evil, than the autocracy. After several months' constant agitation and plotting, they attained success, not because the mass of the Russian people sympathized with their ideas, but because the Russia of 1917 presented an unusually fertile field for their activities. The Russian workmen and the peasants wanted three things, and they cared little how they got them—peace, bread, and land. The liberal government, under Milukoff, had not given them any one of these three things; the Social Revolutionists, under Kerensky, had also failed in bringing peace and prosperity, and thus the opportunity was ripe for a new political faction which had adopted for its war cry "peace, bread, and land." Lenin, Trotski, and their crown played ceaselessly upon these three strings. In early November, 1917, the military forces stationed at Moscow and Petrograd went Bolshevik, enraptured by this promise of peace, bread, and land, and that insured the triumph of the Bolsheviks. There was bloody fighting for a few days, but when it was over Kerensky had fled, and the extreme wing of the Social Democratic party found itself seated on the throne.

#### RUSSIA VOTES AGAINST THE BOLSHEVIK.

Thus this laborite autocracy, like that of the Czar, rested upon militarism. It also, like that of the Czar, rested upon deception. The true inwardness of Bolshevism is understood only when its attitude toward the constitutional assembly is completely comprehended. A constitutional assembly had for decades represented the fondest hope of the Russian revolutionists. A demand for such a gathering, which should be elected by universal secret ballot, and which, when finally assembled, should draw up a constitution for the Russian Republic, had long been the cardinal point in the platform of all parties. The Bolshevik, like all the other parties and factions, had for years declared that only the constitutional assembly could save Russia. Their bitterest attacks on Kerensky had centered on his delay in calling such an assembly, and their first act, they said, would be to hold elections, based on "universal, secret, direct, and equal suffrage" for delegates to this convention. The Kerensky government had already set in motion the preliminaries of his convention when the Bolsheviks drove them from power, and the elections began soon after Lenin and Trotski had seized the government. As the returns came in, however, they definitely proved one thing—the Russian people were not Bolshevik. That "expression of the real will of the Rus-

slan people" which Lenin and Trotski had been vociferously demanding for several years was registering itself strongly against these usurpers. When the votes were counted, it appeared that two-thirds of the delegates were Social Revolutionists and only one-third Bolshevik or Social Revolutionists who usually acted with them. In other words, the nation, freely expressing itself at the polls, had repudiated its saviors. This assembly met, held a single day's session, and then was dispersed by Bolshevik bayonets. The Bolshevik suppressed the convention by violence, precisely as the Czar had suppressed the first Duma, and for precisely the same reason—they could not control it. As a matter of fact they had no use for a constitutional convention, representative of all Russia; they had their own type of government, "the dictatorship of the proletariat," and this they now proceeded to foist upon the Russian people.

#### A REPUBLIC EXCLUSIVELY OF WORKERS.

Having denied to the duly elected representatives of the Russian people the right to frame their constitution, the Lenin and Trotski oligarchy now proceeded to frame their own. The constitution of the "All Russian Socialistic Federal Republic of Soviets"—such is the mouth-filling name of this new State—probably represents the quintessence of Bolshevik wisdom. The new Republic makes no pretense of being a republic of all the Russian citizenry; it is professedly a class affair and it deliberately excludes a large part of the former denizens of the Empire. The constitution specifically describes the Russian Republic as "a free, socialistic community of all the working people of Russia,"—that is, only the working people are entitled to membership in this new State. "All the authority," it says, "belongs to all the working inhabitants of the country"—thus all professional and educated classes, as well as all employers, are definitely excluded. The qualifications for voters rubs in the same idea once more. The electoral franchise is confined to these classes: "Workmen, and employes of all kinds engaged in industry, trade, agriculture, etc., peasants and Cossack peasants who do not engage hired labor for the sake of profit, and soldiers of the Soviet army and navy." Thus even a peasant who hires a man to work for him can not participate in this new government—"the little bourgeoisie," which is the name applied to employing peasants of this type, has long been an object of detestation to men of the Lenin and Trotski school. Besides specifying the people who can vote, this constitution makes the thing doubly sure by giving a long list of persons who can not vote, "even though they should belong to one of the classes already named."

Any man who employs any worker is excluded. Those who live on "unearned income," such as interest from capital, interests from enterprises, income from property, and the like, and all "private traders, trade, and commercial agents" are forever deprived of the ballot. All "monks and clergy" are also kept outside the breastworks. One is surprised to find that this constitution, like the autocratic régime, provides for universal compulsory military service, but here again only the "laboring classes" can become members of the Soviet army and navy. This army, consistently enough, is not organized for the defense of Russia; its only reason for existence is "to insure authority for the working classes and to remove every possibility for the reestablishment of the authority of exploiters"—that is, it is an army of the working class against the capitalists. And the same paragraph of the constitution that provides for "a socialistic Red army of workmen and peasants" also provides for "the complete disarmament of the propertied classes."

#### COMPULSORY LABOR SERVICE.

However, this policy of granting the franchise exclusively to workers has one saving grace, for the constitution introduces not only compulsory military service, but compulsory "labor service." It is evidently the expectation that eventually, the exploiting and "bourgeois" classes will disappear, and that every man, when this ideal state is realized, will earn his living by the sweat of his face. The clauses excluding traders, merchants, and employers from the franchise is intended to apply to Russian society only in its present imperfect shape; when the Bolshevik organization is complete, there will be no such "parasites" as teachers, professors, editors, bankers, manufacturers, traders, and employers, only laborers, and thus everybody will vote because everybody will have this qualification.



This does not mean, as one might at first think, that human society is to revert once more to the standards of the Garden of Eden, or to maintain the level of organization that exists in an Eskimo village. Because there are to be no bankers, and no manufacturers, and no railroad presidents, does not mean that there are to be no banks, no factories, and no railroads. All these activities are to exist the Bolsheviks believe, and exist in a more flourishing state than ever before, only they are to be "nationalized" and "socialized." This Soviet Constitution, with one sweep of the pen, abolishes the "private holding of land," and declares that "all land is declared national property and is given without compensation to the laboring people on the basis of equal use." Similarly "all forests, minerals, and waterways of a general state significance as well as all live and immovable stock, model farms, and agricultural institutions are declared national property." In order to "insure the authority of the working people over the exploiters" all "mills, mines railways, and other means of production and transportation are transferred to the possession of the workmen's and peasant's republic." "As a first blow to international banking and financial capital," the constitution repudiates all foreign loans made by the Czar's government and in order "to liberate the working masses from the yoke of capital," all banks are transferred to the possession of the workmen's and peasant's republic."

In the last year all kinds of picturesque stories have come out of Russia, describing the topsy-turvy state of society that prevails in her economic system. We have heard of workmen taking over the management of railways, banks, and manufacturing plants, of peasants chasing landlords out of their properties and taking possession themselves—of looting, arson, and even murder. These acts represent merely an attempt to reduce this soviet constitution to a working basis. The fact that the utmost disorder has resulted that the whole financial and industrial system has been reduced to chaos, does not disturb the Bolshevik statesmen. Their present work, they assert, is necessarily destructive. They are engaged in a social war—is not the essence of war destruction? Germany started out to destroy the democracy of other countries in order to erect upon its ruins a "higher type" of civilization. Similarly, Lenin and Trotsky are destroying the old social and industrial order that they may rear the Bolshevik state on its wreck. Just as the Germans, in pursuit of the larger good, destroyed cathedrals, leveled cities to the ground, made the whole of northern France a mass of shell craters, and murdered noncombatant women and children, so Lenin and Trotsky burn the manor houses of the landlord class, appropriate their territories, destroy railroads, industrial plants, and sabotage the whole financial system. The Prussian oligarchy and the Bolshevik follow almost identically the same method. Neither draws its authority from the people; the Kaiser asserted a divine right to subdue the world and the Bolshevik similarly claims a kind of mental illumination which convinces him that he is a chosen vessel, that he alone has the truth, that it is his business to convert the people to his doctrines even against the people's own desire—witness the way in which he suppressed, with shot and shell, the constitutional convention which the Russian people had freely elected. The general estimate figures that only 3 per cent of the Russian people are Bolsheviks. The peasants, who make up 86 per cent of the population, are deadly opposed to them. The Bolshevik attempt to deliver the land to the peasants failed lamentably, because this agrarian problem at present is almost insoluble—and this is sufficient reason why the practical peasant should turn against his deliverers.

#### BOLSHEVISM A GERMAN PRODUCT.

What are the chances that this State organization will spread to Germany, perhaps to other countries? Is Bolshevism something peculiarly Russian, or do its seeds exist in all countries? In origin, of course, it is Germanic. The "dictatorship of the proletariat," or the absolute control of political power by the working classes, is simply German socialism. The hatred of the "bourgeoisie," which most regard now as peculiarly Russian, is also part of the Marxian theory.

Yet Bolshevism, as it is raging now in Russia, is really not socialism, or anything else remotely resembling reason. The Bolshevik constitution does present a certain conception of the state, grotesque at it may seem; yet that is not the system that prevails in Russia to-day. How sincere the leaders of the Bolshevik movement are is doubtful; that they have German money is now an established fact; if they lead at all, however, it is merely as generals of a

huge army of saboteurs, most of them crazed with hunger and filled with intense hatred for the classes that they hold responsible for all the miseries of the country.

The two things that make Bolshevism are starvation and military defeat. Any country that has suffered these calamities is facing the danger of this form of social explosion. Germany is experiencing both at the present time; that is why the situation there is dangerous. Probably Germany could survive her terrible military reverses without relapsing into chaos; it is doubtful whether she could survive a long period of starvation.

The German character is naturally brutal and cruel; it has a great fondness for scapegoats; and a hungry stomach will arouse the fiercest instincts of the mob. It is not likely that the much-advertised "education" of the German masses will protect the nation. The German masses are educated in the sense that they can read and write, but they are not intelligent; if they had been, would they have submitted to the Hohenzollern Empire for nearly 50 years? Another dangerous element is the fact that the "proletariat" is a far larger body in Germany than in Russia. The mass of the Russians are peasants, who care nothing for socialism and want only their little plots of land; but German industry in the last 40 years has built up a large working class population that may now begin pillaging its creators. One thing may be predicted; if Bolshevism seizes Germany, much more than the 3 per cent, which has worked such destruction in Russia, will probably take part in the disruption. The surest antidote is the feeding of millions of empty German stomachs; this is something which the world will have to do, not out of love for Germany, but as a matter of self-protection.

The two conditions that chiefly breed Bolshevism—famine and military defeat—are at work in Austria also. Because they do not exist in France, Italy, and England, these countries seem fairly safe from this menace. Italy at one time presented a fertile field for this movement, for Italy was hungry and had suffered military reverses? But Italy is now victorious over her ancient enemy, and has suffered a spiritual uplift that will furnish the best possible germicide for the Bolshevik microbe. Famine has also ceased to be a danger in the Italian home. At one time, France, suffered from Bolshevik agitations, but with French armies in Alsace-Lorraine and on the left bank of the Rhine, and with French larders being stocked from the United States, the French Republic may be regarded as fairly immune. England has its labor unrest, but little at present that looks a precursor of Bolshevism. The whole thing is so foreign to the Anglo-Saxon genius for order, that the idea of such an outbreak in England may be dismissed. As to the United States, the socialist vote, always a negligible factor, was smaller at the recent election than two years before. It is not improbable that this will take the form of a "dictatorship of the proletariat."

Mr. GOMPERS. We must recognize this fact; the war was gloriously won; the scheme of autocracy, imperialism and militarism has been crushed; the thing and the spirit must be crushed, whether that be political, economical, or industrial, and the time has come for a new understanding of relations between employer and employee. The time has come when the workers insist on a new understanding and a new relationship not only between nations and nations but between man and man, regardless of their situation in life. No man can hold himself and say, "I am master of all I survey;" no corporation can do that in our time. We went to war, we made sacrifices, many of our dear sons have paid the supreme sacrifice. We sent our boys. There were not less than sixty of my own blood relations in this war. Two of my grandsons are over there—one in the Aviation Service, one in the Infantry of the American Army of Occupation in Germany. He has been at the battle front, and bears the scars and marks of wounds received in battle. We are living not alone for to-day. There must be some better understanding in these reconstruction days. No employer, no matter how large or powerful or rich he or his corporation may be, can now pretend to be the industrial master of all he surveys. The workers of our country, the citizenship of our country,

demand that there shall be a larger degree of fairness and justice and democracy in industry. With the sacrifice as supreme as it has been in our country—with 4,000,000 of our boys fighting or ready to fight, with all of our people buying from the Government its bonds and war saving stamps, so that the war could be carried on, with the deprivations of the table and the home, the giving, and giving, and giving, as we were urged to give, until it hurts—the result of the war must bring something better than the prewar conditions. The meaning of justice, and the meaning of the pursuit of happiness, is different now than was the general understanding before this tremendous effort was put forth by the people and the Government of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you.

(Whereupon, at 1.20 p. m., the hearing was adjourned subject to the call of the chairman.)



## INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to the call of the chairman, in room 235, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Page, Borah, McLean, Sterling, Phipps, Smith of Georgia, Jones of New Mexico, McKellar, Wolcott and Walsh of Massachusetts.

Also present: E. H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors, chairman of the finance committee and chief executive officer of the United States Steel Corporation; R. V. Lindabury, appearing for United States Steel Corporation; John Reis, vice president of the United States Steel Corporation; W. J. Filbert, comptroller, United States Steel Corporation; James B. Bonner, manager of sales, United States Steel Corporation; C. L. Close, manager bureau of safety, sanitation and welfare, United States Steel Corporation.

The committee proceeded with the investigation of the steel industries strike, pursuant to resolution.

### **STATEMENT OF MR. E. H. GARY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE, AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.**

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Judge Gary, you may follow your own line if you desire and go ahead and discuss the matter, or the committee will ask you questions. Undoubtedly after you get started the committee will ask you questions anyhow, as you will find that it is almost impossible to restrain the committee from asking questions. We would like to hear from you as to the genesis of this strike, the questions involved as you see them, and everything about it.

Now, would you prefer to have the questions deferred until after the conclusion of what you may have to say in a general way, or do you care whether you are interrupted?

Mr. GARY. I think it is immaterial to me, Senator. I have no prepared statement, but I am willing to make some observations at the beginning if desired.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, suppose you go ahead with your observations and the committee will ask you such questions as they may desire as you proceed with your statement.

Mr. GARY. I suppose you know my business connections?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but probably it would be well for you to make that clear in the record.

Mr. GARY. I am the chairman of the board of directors, chairman of the finance committee, and chief executive officer of the United States Steel Corporation in general charge of its affairs. Our corporation has 15 directors; 7 of them compose the finance committee. The board of directors meets monthly; the finance committee weekly, and sometimes between those periods; consequently the finance committee is really the dominating factor in the corporation.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it in effect an executive committee or have you a separate executive committee?

Mr. GARY. No; it is in effect what you might call an executive committee. When the board of directors is not in session the finance committee has all the powers of the board.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are the finance committee and who are the directors?

Mr. GARY. I will just state that in a moment. When the finance committee is not in session, then the chairman of the board of directors and the chairman of the finance committee has the power of the finance committee.

The finance committee is made up of the chairman, the president of the corporation, Mr. J. A. Farrell; Messrs. George F. Baker, sr., chairman of the First National Bank of New York; Henry C. Frick, formerly the principal owner and in charge of the H. C. Frick Coke Co., afterwards chairman of the Carnegie Co., now a retired capitalist; J. P. Morgan, of J. P. Morgan & Co.; Percival Roberts, jr., formerly principal owner, president, and in charge of the Pencoysd Steel Co. of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia; George W. Perkins, for 10 years a partner in the house of J. P. Morgan & Co. and before that vice president of the New York Life Insurance Co., now retired. The other members of the board of directors consist of Thomas Morrison, formerly connected with the Carnegie Co., in charge of blast furnaces, I think, or a blast furnace; Robert Winsor, of Boston, of the firm of Peabody & Co.; Samuel Mather, of Pickands, Mather & Co., owners of iron ore properties, ships, etc., of Cleveland; D. G. Reid, formerly president of the American Tinplate Co., now retired; Judge J. H. Reed, of Pittsburgh, formerly law partner of Senator Knox; Thomas Murray; and John S. Phipps, son of Henry Phipps, whom he succeeded on the board of directors. Henry Phipps was a partner in Carnegie and Phipps, and is retired.

The finance committee is in very close contact and actively interested in the affairs, policies, and management of the corporation and its subsidiary companies. The policies of the corporation are announced by the chairman, who, of course, is active in the finance committee meetings.

It has been well known for several years, more especially during the last two years, that the labor unions were attempting, in their own way, to organize the employees of the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation. That has been frequently and publicly announced.

It has been stated on this floor, before this honorable committee, that the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation have been guilty of ill treatment of their employees, and some

statements made before the committee have been based on misinformation and are absolutely without foundation.

I wish to state, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that there is no basic industry in this country, nor in the world, in my opinion, which has paid larger wages to its employees than the United States Steel Corporation, and perhaps not as large; nor treated its employees with greater respect and consideration than the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries, if as great.

I shall undertake to give you, as much in detail as you care to hear, the figures which I think demonstrate what I have already said.

It has been charged that during the impending strike the subsidiary companies have been guilty of attacking and mistreating the strikers. That is entirely without foundation. There is not a vestige of truth in that statement.

Three instances have been mentioned by a former witness. A photograph was displayed, I think before this committee, and it was said a woman was killed by representatives of a subsidiary company. I have here a copy of that photograph. This photograph, I will say, is made like a postage stamp, so that it can be stuck to another object, and it has been posted all over the country where the men would be likely to see it.

At the top of the photograph it reads:

Shall fiendish cruelty rule America? Mrs. Fannie Snellings shot, brains beaten out, body jumped on, danced on, and ghoulishly mutilated by the Steel Trust's hellish crew. Read the New Majority.

Mrs. Fannie Snellings was shot at a place called Brackenridge, in Pennsylvania. We have no works there; no men there.

If she was killed at that place, concerning which I have no contradiction to make, it was by people other than anyone connected with any subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation or with the corporation itself, or with the knowledge of any of them.

Looking at the picture it seems evident to me this woman was not killed by a bullet wound in the forehead. It seems to me it may be the picture of some one else injured on some other occasion; but of that I must admit I have no knowledge or information.

The CHAIRMAN. Has not your company investigated that matter, in view of the charge made, so that you can tell us exactly how this did happen?

Mr. GARY. We have the coroner's inquest, I think.

Dr. G. L. Baumgartner testified that Mrs. Snellings was not shot in the back; she died of a hemorrhage caused by gunshot wounds in the left side of the head, according to the testimony of Dr. Baumgartner, of Federal Street, Leetonia, who held an autopsy over the bodies of both victims and who was the first witness called.

"Did you find any other abrasions that would indicate violence of any other nature?" the coroner asked. "I saw none," answered the doctor. "Did you not find the gunshot wound in the back?" asked attorney W. J. Brennan. "I made a thorough examination of the body and I did not find a wound in the back."

The CHAIRMAN. That is the record of the coroner's inquest from which you are reading?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the only information you have about it, Judge? We might put that in the record, I assume.

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I though possibly you had had a separate investigation made by your company, a separate investigation of it.

Mr. GARY. We have made inquiry in regard to it, Mr. Chairman, a good deal of inquiry, and there is no doubt the coroner's verdict is based on the facts. It is absolutely certain that none of our interests had anything to do with the matter or had any knowledge whatever with regard to it.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no report that has been made to you with relation to this that you could give us?

Mr. GARY. Nothing in writing.

Senator McKELLER. Your reason for investigating it was because of the testimony that was given before this committee, was it not?

Mr. GARY. Exactly.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have been furnished with a certified copy of the findings of the coroner's jury which conducted the inquest in the Fannie Snellings case. I have asked my secretary to get that document for me, and in the meantime I suggest that we proceed. When the document is presented it may be read and put in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The only point I was getting at is that your company having been charged with this, as you say, I wanted to know whether or not you made an independent investigation or had a report made to you, and if so we would like to have that for the record.

Mr. GARY. We have no report in writing, but we have had conferences with some of our people in regard to it, not because we had any suspicion that any of our people were connected with it, because we do not conduct our affairs in that way, Mr. Chairman—our orders are absolutely positive against precipitating or provoking trouble at any time, under any circumstances, anywhere.

Mr. LINDABURY. This was during the strike of the employees of the Allegheny Coal & Coke Co., was it not?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. LINDABURY. Has your company any interest in that company?

Mr. GARY. None whatever.

Senator JONES. In your inquiries, Judge Gary, did you ascertain that there had been any disturbance at the town of Breckenridge on that day?

Mr. GARY. We did. There was a disturbance there.

Senator JONES. What was the cause of that disturbance?

Mr. GARY. Strikers were, as I understand, attacking coal miners and some of those in charge of the mine fired shots at the strikers, who were attacking them in the usual way, and I presume you know what that is—by the use of brick-bats, clubs, and guns, and almost anything else; and in defending themselves, we are informed, the employees there did fire some shots. I have not read this to see what the verdict finds, but the shot in question was probably fired by the strikers themselves. I think that is the consensus of opinion and the belief, as I have been informed.

Mr. LINDABURY. I have read this, and may I now read just a paragraph—because I have looked over it and the judge has not.

Mrs. Fanny Snellings, labor organizer, met her death while an attack was being made on deputy sheriffs during a riot—



That is the verdict—

Guarding the property of the Allegheny Coal & Coke Co. mine at west Natrona, according to the verdict of the coroner's jury which sat on the woman's death yesterday afternoon. From the testimony introduced here it is certain that there was a riot. There were no innocent bystanders. Therefore everyone in the crowd was guilty of rioting. The deputy sheriffs did their duty when they fired, it is declared.

I suppose it is concluded from that that she was killed by shots fired by deputy sheriffs. I don't know.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you say that your company did not own or have any interest in the Allegheny Coal & Coke Co.?

Mr. GARY. I did say that.

Mr. LINDABURY. And no plant near it?

Mr. GARY. No plant anywhere near it.

Senator SMITH. I suppose your first investigation was to find out whether any of your companies had anything to do with it, and if they did not you had no more responsibility for it than anybody else?

Mr. GARY. Your conclusion is right. I do not know whether it is strictly accurate to say we have examined to find out whether we had anything to do with it, because we have no properties in that vicinity, and we knew that we were not interested in it or in any way connected with it.

Senator WOLCOTT. Let me ask, Judge Gary, if at the time of this killing there were any labor troubles with your company, any strike?

Mr. GARY. I think not. I think this was before the strike against our company was commenced.

Senator PHIPPS. I think it would simplify matters if I presented at this point a certified copy of the findings of the coroner's jury in the case. At the request of the chair I will read these findings. In the usual form of affidavit it states:

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

*Allegheny County, ss:*

An inquisition, taken at Tarentum and first ward, Pittsburgh, in the county of Allegheny, on the 26th of August and 26th day of September, A. D. 1919, before me, Samuel C. Jamison, coroner of the county aforesaid, upon the view of the body of Fanny Snellings then and there lying dead, upon the oath and solemn affirmation of six good and lawful men of the county aforesaid, who, being sworn and affirmed and charged to inquire, on the part of the Commonwealth, when, where, and how, and after what manner, the said Fanny Snellings came to her death, do say, upon their oaths and affirmations aforesaid, that the said Fanny Snellings born ———, 1——; age, about 47 years; nationality, American; social relation, widow; labor organizer, and residing at Fifth Avenue and Ninth Street, New Kensington, Pa.

Came to her death near Allegheny Steel Co. coal mine, Harrison Township, Allegheny County, Pa., on Tuesday, August 26, 1919, at 4 p. m., due to gunshot wound in left temple from gun in the hands of person or persons unknown to the jury during an attack on the sheriff's deputies on August 26, 1919.

And from the evidence and post-mortem examination made the jury find death was due to the above cause and the same was justifiable and in self-defense, and also recommend that Sheriff Haddock be commended in his prompt and successful action in protecting property and persons in that vicinity, and the judgment exercised in the selection of his deputies. We also criticize and deplore the action of alien or foreign agitators who instill anarchy and Bolshevism doctrines into the minds of un-Americans and uneducated aliens.

And so the jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths and affirmations as aforesaid, say that the aforesaid Fanny Sellens, for the cause aforesaid, in the manner and form aforesaid, came to her death, and not otherwise.

In witness whereof, as well as of the aforesaid coroner, we, the jurors, have hereunto put our hands and seals, on the day and year and at the place above mentioned.

SAMUEL C. JAMISON, Coroner.	[SEAL.]
W. H. HARRIS.	[SEAL.]
W. S. WAGNER.	[SEAL.]
W. N. WYLIE.	[SEAL.]
W. S. ROBINSON.	[SEAL.]
J. P. MILLER.	[SEAL.]
W. P. JOHNSTON.	[SEAL.]

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Gary, were any of your employees sheriff's deputies?

Mr. GARY. At this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARY. They were not.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they now?

Mr. GARY. I don't know that there were. There may have been some of them appointed in places. I will not deny that there have been some. There might be, under a stress of circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. And when they are appointed, those deputies, they still remained on your pay roll?

Mr. GARY. Oh, yes—I should think yes. As a rule, they are not appointed. And, so far as I know, they have had nothing to do in any of these difficulties, in these outbreaks.

The CHAIRMAN. The question I am asking you now, which perhaps you can answer, is whether any of your employees at the time of the strike were appointed as sheriff's deputies?

Mr. GARY. I will not deny that some of them may have been, under stress of circumstances, before the police force was adequate, in the opinion of the mayor, or the sheriff's force was adequate. The strikes come on suddenly sometimes.

Senator McKELLAR. Could you get us the figures and the places where they were sworn in as deputies?

Mr. GARY. I think so. I would be glad to.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe you have stated that at this particular time, August 26, none of the employees were serving as deputy sheriffs?

Mr. GARY. That is true. This occurred some time, I think several weeks, before the strike against our companies commenced.

Another witness testified in regard to Mr. Jefferson Davis Pierce, of Worcester, Mass. He said:

In response to the many requests to organize and to have us aid these workers in organizing, we some years ago sent a few organizers into the field.

This was some years ago.

Those men were arrested, driven out of town; one of them was so bludgeoned that within a few months afterwards he died. He was one of our best, most intelligent, and constructive workers in our service.

Senator STERLING. Was there any strike on at that time?

The WITNESS. No, sir. I refer to the late Mr. Jefferson Davis Pierce, of Worcester, Mass.

The son of this man, Jefferson Davis Pierce, jr., having seen an account of this testimony in the newspapers, brought to our offices September 27 an affidavit which he had prepared himself, and which I will read with your permission:

WORCESTER, MASS., September 27, 1919.

I noticed in the papers of last evening and this morning a statement made by President Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of Labor, before

the Senate Investigating Committee, to the effect that an organizer for the Federation of Labor, by name Jefferson Davis Pierce, of Worcester, Mass., was bludgeoned by emissaries of the United States Steel Corporation, and suffered injuries which afterwards resulted in his death.

I wish to make the following statement, of my own free will, and without any coercion on the part of any one, in regard to the death of my father:

"I was with my father the night he received his injuries in Monessen, Pa., and wish to state very emphatically that his injury was not caused by any one connected with the United States Steel Corporation. On the contrary, it was caused by a member of the I. W. W. organization from out of town, who was sent there at the time to create trouble, as the I. W. W. organization was then trying to gain control of the organizing situation.

"I do not remember the exact date when this happened, but it was either latter part of 1912 or early 1913. My father died in December, 1913, about one year after he was injured. His death came from cancer, resulting from a blow he received on the neck at the time of the trouble.

"I wish again most emphatically to refute Mr. Gomper's statement that this injury was caused by some one connected with the U. S. Steel Corporation.

JEFFERSON D. PIERCE."

This was sworn to before G. N. White, notary public of New York County.

Mr. Gary (continuing). This had been prepared and was brought to our office. I don't know who wrote it, but I understood that Mr. Davis wrote it himself and that he composed it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his address?

Mr. GARY. Worcester, Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his business?

Mr. GARY. I think he is connected with the Wire Company there; I am not quite certain, but I think so.

Senator WALSH. The American Steel and Wire Company of Worcester?

Mr. GARY. Yes. It will be very easy to get his address and bring him before you if you desire.

Another witness, I think, testified to a number of deaths and injuries at Hammond, Ind. We had nothing whatever to do with the trouble or the strike at that place. We have no business of any kind, no interests there. The strike was by the employees of the Standard Steel Co., with which we have never had the slightest connection or interest in. I am informed that employees who had remained out of the mills through fear, through intimidation or other reasons, were desirous of going back to the mills, and were on their way back, supported by either the sheriff's deputies or the police, or possibly some one sent by the governor. There was quite a severe struggle at that point. While on the way to the shops they were interrupted by, whatever you may call them and whomsoever they may have been, and with force, by the use of brickbats, which were thrown in such a way that they injured the deputies; and the officers pressing their way toward the mill, having been thus attacked, did fire some shots. The exact result I do not know, except from the newspapers, and perhaps you know more about it than I do. But certainly none of our companies was in any way responsible in the matter.

Senator JONES. When was it alleged this occurred at Hammond, Judge Gary?

Mr. GARY. It was several weeks, perhaps some months, before the present strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Judge Gary, has it not been stated as a fact that the International Union, to which these employees belonged, had

accepted terms proposed by the Standard Steel Car Co., and that these employees were returning to work with the full knowledge and consent and under advice of the officers of the union to which they belonged?

Mr. GARY. Senator, I am unable to answer that question. I do not know.

Senator PHIPPS. I know that that statement has been made.

Mr. LINDABURY. It has been so publicly stated, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. I did not know whether you were informed as to its accuracy or not.

Mr. GARY. It has been so stated. This strike has been conducted in many respects like other strikes, only worse in some of its features. The large majority of our workmen were not desirous of engaging in a strike. They were not members of any labor union; they had declined to become such, year after year. Throughout the war when production, particularly of steel, was the greatest military necessity of the United States Government and its associates in the war, saving perhaps food, and when our corporation, furnishing perhaps about half of the steel, as to some products perhaps more than half, our men, our workmen, were loyal and efficient. There was never any interruption of consequence in any of our works during the war period. And while it is true that there is a radical element of foreigners at the present time, it is only doing justice to say that in my opinion, based on experience during the war and at other times, the majority of the foreigners are good citizens, loyal to this country and loyal to their employers.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "foreigners," Judge, what do you mean? Not naturalized citizens?

Mr. GARY. I will include them, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. But when you use the term "foreigners" do you mean those who have been naturalized, born in foreign countries?

Mr. GARY. I include all foreigners, all foreign born, I mean.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of your employees are foreign born?

Mr. GARY. I can not give that exactly, not now.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give that later?

Mr. GARY. Yes; we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us also the proportion who are un-naturalized, and are still foreigners?

Mr. GARY. We can do that. It takes time to get those figures, but we can and will do it. We will furnish you any figures and any data you want, on request, that is within our reach.

The CHAIRMAN. We should like that. How many different nationalities are employed in your mills?

Mr. GARY. I can not tell you offhand; a great many.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a statement, by Mr. Gompers, I think, that some orders had to be issued in 22 different languages. Do you think that is correct?

Mr. GARY. I think that might be true. I think I will produce some exhibits to show you the activities of foreigners with unpronounceable names in the welfare work of the subsidiaries companies, showing that they were actively engaged in work which is entirely

antagonistic to the idea that they are in servitude or unwilling or dissatisfied workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Gary, do you know how many of those workers subscribed to the Liberty loans?

Mr. GARY. Well, I have those figures. I will give you them. I have the figures in regard to the subscriptions to the Liberty loans by employees, and also the subscriptions to the Red Cross and other similar organizations. I know that it will surprise you.

The CHAIRMAN. Will those figures show, Judge Gary, as to the men who have gone out on strike, how many of those men were subscribers to the Liberty loan and to the Red Cross?

Mr. GARY. I should doubt that, Senator. It may be so, and if so the papers which will be furnished to your committee will speak for themselves. I doubt that, though. I do not believe there has been any record to indicate that.

I started to say, Senator—

The CHAIRMAN. Before you get away from that—

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not believe, do you, that the men who have gone out on strike are men who did not subscribe for Liberty bonds or did not subscribe to the Red Cross?

Mr. GARY. I could answer that question better if I knew how many men are out on strike. We would like to know that.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to know that—how many men are out.

Judge GARY. So would I. I will tell you why I make that answer. I had started to say that this strike was conducted like other strikes, only it was worse in many of its aspects. This strike was inaugurated by the union leaders, not by the men. The union leaders have been attempting all these years to organize the men. The men have not been seeking the assistance of anyone to organize them.

Senator WALSH. What union leaders? What are the names of the unions you refer to?

Mr. GARY. Well, the American Federation of Labor, I will say, generally speaking. Strikes were threatened from time to time; there have been a great many threats by union leaders, going back over quite a long period. They say we obstructed their movements, we interfered with their program. If we did it was because we treated our men in such a way that they preferred to remain outside of the unions. But the strike was anticipated by threats, intimidations and promises of various kinds which might appeal to the natural cupidity of uneducated workmen. I have several specimens with me, a good many specimens—I will say a number of specimens that have been sent to me—of letters sent to the families of the workmen, which I will produce for the inspection of the Senators if desired.

Well, the strike was called. The threats had been made, we do not know how many, we have a great deal of hearsay testimony on that subject—statements made by families—of threats to burn their houses, to blow up their houses, to kidnap their children, to kill the workmen, and so forth and so forth; and when the strike was called large numbers of men, if we may believe them in their statements made at the time and that have been made since, remained away from their working places because they were afraid to go, and because they did not believe the protection furnished by the State or cities or the

sheriffs was adequate. After the protection had been furnished in many places the men have commenced to return to their shops. Now, if you include all the men who remained away from their shops after the strike was called, I think it is a fair statement to say not over 28 per cent of the total employees of the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation were out, remained away. But if you limit that to the manufacturing companies where the strikes have actually been pending, it might have been as high as 40 per cent at one time. I will say that is the outside figure, and we have taken considerable pains to ascertain the facts in relation to it.

Senator STERLING. Now, Mr. Gary, this figure of 28 per cent which you have stated, would that include not only those men who actually struck but those who remained at home because of fear for their safety?

Mr. GARY. Yes, it would.

Senator PHIPPS. Judge Gary, I think that the members of the committee would like to see some of those specimens in the form of the threats, that were received.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. Before you go to that, Judge Gary, will you explain, please, if you have not already done so, just what you meant by your last statement there in reference to including some other manufacturing establishments. If you have already explained that, you need not repeat it. Have you already explained that?

Mr. GARY. I have not. I said the manufacturing companies where strikes have been pending, where the men were actually called out. We have a number of other companies, for instance our mining companies, and so forth. That only bears on the general statement—

Senator WOLCOTT. I see.

Mr. GARY. One statement that went uncontradicted for some time was that 95 per cent of our men had struck, and things of that kind.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you any figures as to how many of the men have returned to work since the strike was called?

Mr. GARY. I have not got those figures exactly, but they are coming back every day. More came back yesterday than any other day since the strike was inaugurated. From the time the strike started, up to the present time, there has been a steady and progressive improvement. And, as I said, yesterday there were more returned than any other day, and the day before that more returned than the day before that.

Senator McKELLAR. You have not got any actual figures as to how many have returned each day?

Mr. GARY. We get them every day; but I have not got those figures here, and I have not counted them up.

Senator JONES. Judge Gary, let me see if I understand your statement. Of all your employees, only 28 per cent left their daily labor?

Mr. GARY. Those are the figures which have been compiled by our people, and it is on those reports—

Senator JONES. But that would include places where there was no strike at all?

Mr. GARY. It would.

Senator JONES. Of the places where there is a strike, about 40 per cent have failed to report for duty?

Mr. GARY. I did not say about 40, but you might have concluded that as my answer; you might properly have concluded it. I did say it would not exceed 40 per cent, in my judgment.

Mr. LINDABURY. At the peak, I think he said.

Senator JONES. That is what I understood. About how many have you employed under those figures?

Mr. GARY. About 250,000, perhaps 260,000.

Senator JONES. In the subsidiaries?

Mr. GARY. Of course, during the peak of the war we had more than that, and we were producing as much as we possibly could.

Senator McKELLAR. About 260,000, as a maximum, in all companies, both the principal company and the subsidiary companies?

Mr. GARY. At the present time.

Senator WALSH. I think we should confine our figures, Mr. Chairman, to the plants where there is a strike as much as possible, otherwise it would be very confusing.

The CHAIRMAN. If I understood you correctly, you spoke of mining companies?

Mr. GARY. Yes; we have mining companies, iron and coal both.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Steel Corporation operate mining companies?

Mr. GARY. Different subsidiaries; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you operating any coal mining companies?

Mr. GARY. We are.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are they located?

Mr. GARY. Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. How extensive are your operations in coal mining?

Mr. GARY. Oh, they are very large. We mine for our own coke, and the tonnage is very large. I think I can give you the number of men employed in the different mines.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have them, in the mining companies.

Senator PHIPPS. Judge Gary, we would like to have it along these lines. For instance, could you give us the number of employees in the steel plants where the strike was called, and can you divide those figures as between skilled labor and the unskilled or the ordinary day laborers? We would like to have a picture of this situation that will convey to our minds the number of men directly affected by the strike as called by the unions.

Mr. GARY. I think we can make up those figures for you, Senator.

Senator PAGE. Judge Gary, you remarked that the larger part of your coal was mined for your own companies. Is it all mined by your own companies, or is a part of it purchased?

Mr. GARY. We do generally purchase some coal.

Senator PAGE. But the great bulk of it is from your own mines?

Mr. GARY. Yes; it is. Of course, in my statements of these percentages I have attempted to be accurate, based on my information from our own people making up the figures for our own consideration, and I might be a little out of the way. I hope not. But I will not intentionally exaggerate any fact, of course.

Senator STERLING. When you speak of 250,000 to 260,000 employees, Judge Gary, do you include those engaged in the mining of coal as well as in the manufacture of steel?

Mr. GARY. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us any idea of the turnover of unskilled labor and of skilled labor?

Mr. GARY. I can not offhand. We have had that up in discussions many times, too. During the war it was greater than under normal conditions in ordinary times. But I can not give it exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give it for the last year?

Mr. GARY. I can not do it now, no.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have that, if you can furnish it?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Judge Gary, there was quite a contention made by one or more of the witnesses that the hours of labor were long, very much longer than they were in other companies. Will you discuss that question, if it is the time for you to do it?

Mr. GARY. If you do not object, Senator, I would like right now, before proceeding to that point—

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). Surely. We will just take it up later. Go ahead in your own way.

Mr. GARY. Very Well. I have been somewhat diverted from my original intention, which is entirely immaterial, but perhaps would have saved you some time if I had proceeded; although I find no fault. I am very glad to answer any questions that I can at any time.

I want to refer to the wages, first, that we are paying. I consider this important. The lowest wage rates pertain to unskilled labor, working 10 hours per day, at 42 cents per hour, on our basic eight-hour-day plan, 42 cents per hour for eight hours and for the hours over eight, time and a half, at the rate of 63 cents per hour, making \$4.62 for the 10-hour day.

Senator McKELLAR. That is your cheapest labor?

Mr. GARY. That is the cheapest labor for men. There are boys opening doors and things like that—I believe I found some getting \$3 a day, not very many.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the war what did that labor get?

Mr. GARY. I have that. Let me put in this statement first.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. GARY. And I will take that up next.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. GARY. Highest earnings, rollers, \$32.56 per day.

Senator McKELLAR. \$32.56?

Mr. GARY. \$32.56.

Senator McKELLAR. That is for rollers?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What do rollers do?

Mr. GARY. They roll the hot metal into shapes as it passes through rollers.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they employ men under them and pay them out of that wage?

Mr. GARY. Not as a rule. There have been instances where that has been done to some extent, but not as a rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the average wage of the rollers?

Mr. GARY. Oh, no, I said that is the highest. I will give you averages a little later.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there who receive that large wage?



Mr. GARY. I do not know as I have the number. I have the figures, though, showing the average. But let me finish this page, and see if it covers that.

The general average of the manufacturing companies, all employees, not including executive, administrative and selling, \$6.27 per day.

Senator McKELLAR. \$6.27?

Mr. GARY. \$6.27.

Senator WOLCOTT. That is a 10-hour day, is it?

Mr. GARY. That is a 10-hour day.

Senator WOLCOTT. Time and a half—

Mr. LINDABURY (interposing). That is without regard to hours.

Mr. GARY. That is the average, without regard to hours. There are some 12 hours a day, and I will come to that; and some 8 hours a day. Where the work is hard, and the men themselves desired to work eight hours, they are allowed to do so. I will come to that eight-hour proposition in a moment, because I see you are interested in it. Of course, it is a very important subject at this time, at this particular period in the history of the industries of this country. We all admit that, and I would be very glad to discuss it with you frankly a little later on and give you the facts.

Senator McKELLAR. This \$6.27 average is for manufacturing plants, as I understand it?

Mr. GARY. Yes, that is for manufacturing plants.

The average for unskilled labor is \$5 per day and for skilled \$6.70.

Now, if you ask why the average is \$5, when the lowest is \$4.62, I will just read this brief statement, and you will see the point of it, I am sure, without any explanation.

In reference to rates of wages and promotions in mills of the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation, I understand the practice to be that the wage rates of employees in the same classified occupations, in the same plant, are adjusted in accordance with the merits and ability of the respective individuals, and that promotions are made to higher rated positions in the same classified conditions, and to other occupations of higher grades, as vacancies occur or additional men are needed on the basis of merit and ability of the respective employees.

In other words, under the open shop practice a man in the shop is treated in accordance with his merits. If a man in a department is promoted to a higher paying department, then the man who comes up to take the place of the one who has been promoted is selected because of his merits. That is the plan.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gary, are you through with this question of average wage? I want to ask you some questions about that when you reach a proper point.

Mr. GARY. Not quite, Senator.

With reference to the 12-hour turn employees, 26½ per cent of all employees work the 12-hour turn and the number is 69,284. I am going to put this statement in, Senator.

The number working 8 and 10 hours is 191,896; approximately, 8 hours, 88,994, and 10 hours, 102,902.

Here is a statement of comparative average earnings per man per day, not including executive, administrative, and selling.

For the year 1914, in manufacturing, the wages were \$2.93; July, 1919, \$6.27, an increase of 114 per cent.

Coal and coke in 1914, \$2.74 per day; July, 1919, \$5.20 per day, an increase of 89.8 per cent. Iron ore, \$2.75 in 1914; \$5.70 in 1919, an increase of 107.3 per cent.

Shipbuilding—we have two shipbuilding yards, as you know, built during the war at the request of the Government when they were calling for more and more ships—in July, 1919, \$5.53.

Transportation in 1914, \$2.71; \$5.02 in July, 1919, an increase of 85.3 per cent.

Miscellaneous, \$2.26 in 1914; in 1919, \$4.48, an increase of 98.2 per cent.

All companies, 1914, \$2.88; July, 1919, \$5.99, an increase of 108 per cent.

Unskilled labor, 10 hours, 1914, \$2 per day; July, 1919, \$4.62, an increase of 131 per cent.

Twelve hours, in 1914, \$2.40; in July, 1919, \$5.88; an increase of 145 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you about the averages which you are reading. You gave the average of \$6.27 per day. That is in your last annual report, is it not, figured out?

Mr. GARY. Not up to date, of course. This is up to date.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you include in that? Do you include salaries of your officials and superintendents?

Mr. GARY. No, I have excluded that; not including executive, administrative and selling departments.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the foremen included in that?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the superintendents are not included?

Mr. GARY. Yes, superintendents and foremen.

The CHAIRMAN. Superintendents and foremen are included?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How do the salaries of the superintendents run?

Mr. GARY. Taking the superintendents and foremen—if I were to take those out it would not change this to any appreciable extent, not a cent a day, perhaps not a mill a day.

The CHAIRMAN. You think not a mill a day?

Mr. GARY. I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. What salaries do you pay superintendents?

Mr. GARY. That depends upon the superintendent, you know.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the highest one you pay—you need not give his name—what is the highest amount?

Mr. GARY. I can not tell off-hand. We may pay some superintendents—I prefer not to guess at it—but we may pay some superintendents as high as \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, possibly a little higher, possibly a little lower.

The CHAIRMAN. And the foremen, how high do you pay them?

Mr. GARY. You understand I am not claiming to be strictly accurate in regard to that. I am giving you my best recollection and impression—

The CHAIRMAN. We understand that, Mr. Gary.

Mr. GARY. Those salaries change. In our corporation promotions are made and increases in salaries are made according to merit.

The CHAIRMAN. In this average you include none of the officials' salaries?

Mr. GARY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not include your own salary?

Mr. GARY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you spoke of rollers, the highest one receiving \$32.56 per day. Are those rollers paid by the ton or paid by the day?

Mr. GARY. I believe they get a per diem and a tonnage rate also.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they not pay their helper?

Mr. GARY. They do not, not out of this. As a matter of fact, there are a few—for instance, a man becomes old, or is getting toward old age, I will say, and he is not as vigorous and strong and able to do his work as in his younger days. Of course it is our desire to keep a man if we can, if there is any way to keep him and it is his desire to remain with us. He may say, "I will continue that job," and in order to perform his work satisfactorily to himself and to his employer he will secure the services of an aid, and he may pay that aid in some cases \$4 or \$5 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, how many men, rollers, receiving that much per day have you?

Mr. GARY. Senator, I believe there is only one who gets as high as \$32.56, but there are quite a number ranging from \$29.00 to \$32.56, or in that neighborhood—\$28 or \$29.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many ranging from \$29 up?

Mr. GARY. I do not know that I can tell that; quite a number, a good many.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean by that 10 or 12?

Mr. GARY. Oh, more than that.

The CHAIRMAN. Or a hundred?

Mr. GARY. More than that.

The CHAIRMAN. But you can not give us the number?

Mr. GARY. We can get it, but it will take a long time. You had better give us time to furnish that if it is material.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many are there receiving 42 cents per hour?

Senator McKellar. I think he has given that.

Mr. GARY. A large majority, of course.

Senator Walsh. It seems to me we are not striking the issue here. Whether or not these men are well paid is a matter for us to consider on the question whether the contention of the strikers is just or not. What we should like to get here is what led up to this strike and what is in the claim that was made, Judge Gary. We should like to know when you first learned there was discontent and the strike coming. This may all be in point as showing that the strike was not justified, but I think we should like to know something about just what was the cause of this strike.

Senator McKellar. While Judge Gary is on this subject I should like him to tell us about the hours of labor. That was very greatly stressed here the other day.

Senator Phipps. If I may interpose as to one feature, this skilled labor, which I do not think is generally understood. Is it not the fact that the up-to-date rolling mills, particularly those manufacturing the heavier shapes, are practically automatic; that the roller does not lift or in fact handle the steel itself; that it is handled by the electrically driven machinery, automatically, and that the roller's

chief duty is to know that the steel is of the proper temperature when it is put into the process of rolling, and particularly while it is being finished, and that the gauges must be perfectly accurate, and that his main duty is to know that the rolls in each set, in each pass, are accurately adjusted so that he will roll the size and the weight?

Mr. GARY. Senator, you are exactly right. It is because he is skillful in those adjustments that he receives the high pay.

Senator PHIPPS. It is not a question of physical labor or enduring the heat?

Mr. GARY. Nowadays none of these men, with very few exceptions, perform manual labor as I used to perform it on the farm, and perhaps some of the rest of you, neither in hours nor in actual physical exertion. It is practically all done everywhere by machinery. The boy who opens the door, I think, touches a button and opens the door. And this work of adjusting the heavy iron ingots is done by the pulling of a lever. It is largely machinery, almost altogether machinery. That is not saying there is no work in that, because of course there is; I would not belittle it, of course. It is hard work to work hard whatever one does, and to the extent one does work hard he, of course, is doing hard work. That is perfectly evident.

Senator PHIPPS. There is another point which has been discussed here, that of continuous operation. Even on an eight-hour turn do these rollers and heaters and helpers work continuously during that period, or are there not considerable intervals between heats, or the process of rolling, so that as a matter of fact the actual employment is nearer 50 per cent than 100 per cent of the time expired?

Mr. GARY. Of course, it is well known to anyone who is connected with the business that the men who work, these rollers who work 11 hours, the furnace men who work 12 hours, they are not actually working more than half the time. They work about an hour and a half and rest about an hour and a half.

I should like to exhibit some pictures, photographs, of men at ease, while they are actually in attendance, actually on duty, actually engaged in the 12-hour day work, which will perhaps show whether these men are overworked or not. Of course, I want to answer Senator McKellar's question whenever I have a chance, because that is important—

Senator MCKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. GARY. That is one of the important questions under investigation and consideration by the employers as well as the employees, and by the general public. I know that perfectly well.

Senator MCKELLAR. At the proper time just give your explanation of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Gary, do you think it would be possible to follow the suggestion of Senator Walsh, and come down to the real causes of the strike, or do you want to pursue the history further?

Mr. GARY. I do not care. I am willing to be interrupted at any time.

Senator WALSH. It seems to me this issue is a very important one in arriving at whether the claim of the workmen is just or not, but what we are concerned about is just what caused this strike, what were the steps immediately preceding the men leaving the work, what the men did, or their representatives, and what you did. I think that will help us.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we come to that.

Mr. GARY. May I exhibit this picture first? There are some men in attendance during a twelve-hour day and there they are at ease. I do not know who took that picture; it was taken by someone in the mill, some of the men themselves, perhaps. There is a good deal to be said in regard to these hours, and a good deal of evidence on it. I understand Senator Walsh's question, and I will come to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Gompers have both said the strike was caused by your refusal to meet a committee of the men. That gets down to the issues that are before us.

Mr. GARY. They ought to know if they called it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you agree that that was the cause of the strike?

Mr. GARY. I will agree to the statement that there was no cause. The men were not complaining; the workmen had found no fault. We are on the best of terms with our men and have always been, with some very slight exceptions, very inconsequential exceptions.

Senator WALSH. How did you personally know that hundreds and thousands of your men were content and satisfied?

Mr. GARY. Senator, I know it because I make it my particular business all the time to know the frame of mind of our people. Not that I visit every man; I do not do that; of course, I could not do that; not that there could be something done or something said in the mills that I would not know; but, in the first place, my instructions regarding the treatment of the men are absolutely positive, given to the presidents at the presidents' meetings regularly—plenty of my remarks to the presidents have been printed and can be exhibited if necessary—and because I am inquiring into that; and we have a man at the head of our welfare department, Mr. Close, who is here, who is around among the works frequently, and all the time, more or less, trying to ascertain conditions; because public writers, unbeknown to us, have been among our works making inquiries and reporting and writing articles on the subject; and because we come in contact with the foremen and often with the men, going through the mills, Mr. Farrell and myself, and others from time to time; because we have a standing rule, and have had, that if any of our men in any department are dissatisfied in any respect they may come singly or they may come in groups, as they may choose, to the foremen and ask for adjustments, make complaints, and if necessary they may come before the president of the company, or they may come to the chairman of the Corporation. Now then, sometimes there have been complaints made. For instance, to mention a somewhat trivial circumstance, some three or four years ago—not to be exactly specific as to date—one of our presidents telephoned to the president of our Corporation, who is in general charge of operations, that a certain number of men—it may have been a thousand or it may have been two thousand men—in a certain mill had all gone out, and his report was that there was no reason for their going out—

Senator STERLING. When you speak of "one of our presidents," you mean the president of a subsidiary company?

Mr. GARY. Yes; the president of a subsidiary company. And he said, "It is very easy for me to fill this mill, and I will proceed to do it." The president of the corporation came to me immediately and reported this. I said, "Tell him to wait and to come to New York." He came the next morning and he made substantially that same statement to me. I said, "Have you taken pains to find out: has anybody spoken to you?" "No," he said, "I have not received any complaint whatever." I said, "Are you sure no complaint has been made to anyone?" He said, "I will find out." I said, "You had better do so before you decide what you are going to do or what you propose to do." He went back; got hold of the foreman. A committee of men had come to the foreman and said that they thought three things, if I remember, were wrong—not very important, but they claimed they were wrong. And the president came back the second time and reported that; and I said, "Well, now, if they state the facts there, isn't the company wrong?" "Well," he said, "I don't consider it very important." I said, "That is not the question. Are you wrong in any respect? It seems to me you are wrong with respect to two of those things, and the other, not. Now, you go right back to your factory and just put up a sign that, with reference to those two particular things, the practice will be changed."

The CHAIRMAN. How many languages would you have that printed in? A lot of them could not read it, could they?

Mr. GARY. What is it?

The CHAIRMAN. You would have to print that in about 22 languages, would you not?

Mr. GARY. Well, we do frequently put up notices in several different languages; but, Senator, there is generally some one of the different nationalities who can speak and who can read English and who reports. Moreover, they have their assistants in various ways, their professional men, their physicians, and the clergy particularly. I do not know whether any of you Senators have talked with any of the clergy or any of that class of men in regard to our mill conditions. If you have not, while it may seem inconsequential, I think it is very important—

Senator WALSH. Do I correctly understand your position to be this: First, will you admit you declined to see these men? Second, that you did not decline because of their official capacity, but because from your investigations, and inquiries, and your sources of information, you believed your workmen were contented and satisfied?

Mr. GARY. You have given part of the reason, but not all.

Senator WALSH. Did you decline because they were officials of organized labor or because you believed they did not represent the true feelings and sentiments of your employees?

Mr. GARY. That is right—that they did not represent our employees, that they were not authorized to speak for them, and we were absolutely certain they did not represent the sentiment of the large majority of our people, if any of them. Otherwise, we would have heard them, and of course if anything had been wrong we would have corrected it, as we always did. And, notwithstanding all that has been said here, I want to say with emphasis, Senator, we have made it our business to treat our men right; and I want

to show you before I am through, if you will allow me, why I think I am justified in saying that. I have no feeling in regard to this matter.

Senator WALSH. Did you know when you declined to see these men that it might lead to a strike?

Mr. GARY. I didn't think of it at all; it didn't occur to me; it was not suggested; although I knew these union labor leaders were trying to organize our company. But the question of a strike did not—

Senator WALSH. Have you not learned since, that some of these men did represent some of your employees, because some of your employees did go out on strike at their command?

Mr. GARY. I have learned that a small percentage of our men at that time had joined the unions, and in fact I supposed that before. I have supposed all the time that there was a percentage of our men that belonged to unions. I believed that was true and of course they had a right to belong to unions, and we make no objection to that; notwithstanding what has been said, we make no objection to it whatever; but—

Senator WALSH. Was there any other reason for your refusal to hear these men, to see whether they did represent your men or not, except that your personal investigation satisfied you that they could not enlighten you any about the condition of your workmen and their relationship to your company?

Mr. GARY. Well, I want to be frank enough to say that it has been my policy, and the policy of our corporation, not to deal with union labor leaders.

Senator WALSH. Any way, at any time?

Mr. GARY. At any time. And for the reason we do not believe in contracting with unions. When an employer contracts with the union labor leaders he immediately drives all of his employees into the unions. Otherwise, they can not get employment. That is a part of the reason for trying to organize the men, and that is why we have been such an obstruction. I am not antagonizing unions, I am not saying that they have not a perfect right to form unions, of course they have; but we are not obliged to contract with them if we do not choose to do so; and we think, because of many things that have happened—and some of them are happening to-day—that unionism is not a good thing for the employer or employee to-day, either one, any more than the man who does belong to a union should be prohibited from working in our shop.

Senator WALSH. Is it not practically setting up an opposition to unions to refuse to meet and talk over labor conditions with their representatives?

Mr. GARY. Well, I don't think so, Senator.

Senator WALSH. Is it not practically notice to every employee that the officials of the company do not recognize and do not want unions in their establishments?

Mr. GARY. Well, I can not quite concede that, Senator, although I will concede that it is notice to the men that we do not contract with the unions.

Senator WALSH. Yet you say that the men have a right to unionize.

Mr. GARY. Of course they have.

Senator WALSH. What good is the right to unionizing if the leaders or representatives can not talk with their employers? What is the use of a union if the leaders of the men can not talk to the employers? Is it simply a social society?

Mr. GARY. I do not think the leader should undertake to talk with the employers—of a few of the men in a shop—when they know in advance that no contracts are made with the union labor leaders, and especially when the men themselves are not requesting it. Now these men say—they have said here that the men were requesting them.

Senator WALSH. It is evident, Judge Gary, that 40 per cent of your men were interested because they obeyed these men when they called a strike afterward, or some part of the 40 per cent. I will put it that way, some part of the 40 per cent they represented, didn't they?

Mr. GARY. In that way, yes.

Senator WOLCOTT. When you say, Judge Gary, that it is the policy of your corporation to decline to do business with the union leaders, do I understand you to mean that you decline to talk with leaders representing the men, those who are spokesmen for the men, those spokesmen being part of the men, or when you speak of union leaders do you refer to outsiders?

Mr. GARY. I am referring to outsiders.

Senator WOLCOTT. You do recognize then the wisdom and the reasonableness of affording recognition to the spokesmen of the men who are themselves working in the mill.

Mr. GARY. Yes, if a committee from any particular department, any one of them, desire to confer with any of our people in regard to any matters in the mills, they are welcome, regardless of the question as to whether they belong to unions or not. But in this case these union leaders were men entirely outside, men who were trying to organize the mills which were not organized when they had not been requested by the men to do so. They had nothing whatever to do with our business or our affairs, any more than a man would have to interfere with the—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). But, Judge Gary, if they had nothing to do with your business or with your affairs, how could they have gotten the men to follow them? If they had nothing to do with your affairs or your business, if they did not represent them, how could they have gotten the men to follow them?

Mr. GARY. I will try to answer that, Senator.

Senator WALSH. If you please.

Mr. GARY. I think about 10 per cent, possibly 15 per cent, have joined the union after a long campaign, and very many influences were resorted to in order to get them to sign up. But they called out all the employees. That was a part of the plan to organize the mills, which they had not been able to do otherwise. They would not wait, at the President's request, because they were afraid that the few they had in would all go out of the unions—at least it has been so stated and I believe it is true. When they were called out of course the 10 per cent or 15 per cent—I say 10 per cent—of course they would go out, Senator; they would go out when they were called to go or else they would have to leave the union. Then when they went out and began their intimidation and all that sort of



thing, a large number of other men stayed away, remained at home. That was a part of the plan. They expected that.

Senator BORAH. When you say, Judge, that these men who sought interviews with you in your opinion did not represent your people, that they had interposed themselves into your affairs, that is a very interesting statement and to my mind throws a great deal of light upon this matter, if it be true. What are the facts? What are the facts disclosing the propositions or proving the proposition that you have just stated?

Mr. GARY. You mean on which I have based my opinion or statements?

Senator BORAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARY. Information derived from the men themselves in various ways. The foreman is always very free with his men: he always knows them; he always knows what is going on. Outsiders go among our men and get the fact, and very frequently get letters from our men. We have, said, 75,000 employees who are stockholders in our company; they attend our stockholders' meetings sometimes, come there voluntarily; and some of them have made speeches, and we have some of the speeches here, and they are quite free. I do not know whether you noticed, for instance, in yesterday morning's Washington Post an article by George Rothwell Brown, who visited Newcastle, and who states here at great length the circumstances surrounding his visit to Newcastle and vicinity and his coming into contact with the different men and talking with them, and he states that he found them well treated and well satisfied and well pleased with their conditions.

We know pretty well. As I say, our welfare department—I do not know whether you were here, Senator, when I spoke of it, but we have a big welfare department, and I will show you how many million dollars we have expended in that department for the benefit of our workmen, and I think you will be somewhat surprised. And we have welfare committees, large numbers of them; I think at the present time we have, say, 5,000 men serving on those committees, of employees. I have here, and I would like to show you just one or two pictures. I would like Senator Borah to see some of those pictures with the names on them here [referring to photographs]. Here is the bar mill safety committee, Charles Scog, Thomas Sangres, A. McWilliams, Charles Schiedemantal, Ed. Lindburg, Mark Wilson, Fred Thomas, etc., and other names very much more difficult of pronunciation, many of them, a large number of them foreigners. These men, members of the committee, are in consultation with the chairman of the committee. Would you like to see it, Senator? I would be very glad to have the Senator see them.

The CHAIRMAN. If this committee that came to see you had been composed of men who were actually working in your mills, even though they had been union men, would you have received them and talked with them, Mr. Gary?

Mr. GARY. Yes; unless they came specifically as union leaders. Then I do not know whether I would or not. They did not come that way, and therefore I do not have to decide that question; it has not come up. However, I will say this, Senator, if you will allow me: If a committee had come to me and stated that they were dissatisfied with the subsidiary company's treatment, and asked

permission to see me to present any matters whatsoever, I would not have inquired whether they belonged to any union or not. That would have been immaterial, entirely immaterial, if they came as workmen from the mill.

The CHAIRMAN. But they had come to you as a committee from the mill and these leaders had not been connected with the committee but came as representing the men in the mill, and if they had belonged to unions, would you have received them?

Mr. GARY. Certainly.

Senator STERLING. Do you know, Judge Gary, who the members of this committee were who sought to interview you? Do you know the names of the members of this committee?

Judge GARY. I did know. I do not know them personally, any one of them. As I said in my letter to the President—I do not know whether you are familiar with that or not—on that subject, this question of unionism, gentlemen, all comes down to the one question of an open shop or a closed shop. If you make contracts with labor unions, if you recognize the leaders of labor unions, it forces everyone to go into the unions and that means a closed shop, and one who is not a member of a labor union can not get employment there. We stand for the open shop. We insist that the men can come into our shop and work for us and stay there whether they belong to a union or not, and we never ask the question. We have known that we have had a good many union men, of course. While it has been said we discharged them and tried to get rid of them, there is no foundation for that statement. If that has even been done in a single case or in a few cases, if it has ever been done, which I deny, it has been contrary to our positive instructions and would not have been permitted, and the man would be disciplined if he disobeyed those instructions the second time. Will you allow me to read my letter—

Senator STERLING. Just one question there, Judge Gary. While it was your policy not to deal with the union or the union leaders, did you seek to prevent the organization of unions within the shops?

Mr. GARY. We did not in any respect.

Senator BORAH. I saw a statement published in a paper in which you stated that you could not arbitrate this matter because of the moral question involved. Now, it seems to me that underlying all this controversy must be some fundamental principle which is fastened in your mind as a guiding proposition for your conduct and for your actions in regard to this matter; and aside from the question of wages and hours of labor and the manner in which the men have been taken care of, I think the whole committee would like to know what you deem to be the fundamental issue which you can not arbitrate or consider in connection with the representatives of these men. Will you state what you conceive to be the fundamental issue or the moral question which you said was involved which you could arbitrate?

Mr. GARY. Well, Senator, the fundamental issue, as I conceive it, is the question of an open shop or a closed shop, the question of allowing a man to work where he pleases, whether he belongs to a union or not, and the right of an employer to employ a man in his shop whether the man is a union man or is not. I believe that it is well known all over the world and is the opinion of a large majority of

the people of the world that the open shop is essential to progress and prosperity, and that the closed shop means less production, less work, higher costs.

I think, when you are discussing the question of the high cost of living, there is nothing more important to consider with it than that manufacturing establishments shall be allowed to operate, unrestricted by labor unions or anybody else, depending upon the good will of the laborers, the workmen themselves, who of course are controlled by the treatment they receive, including wage rates and working and living conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there—

Mr. GARY (interposing). Pardon me. Now, then, I have the impression from your question—I may be mistaken—that you are really aiming at something else; you have something else in mind. And the only reason I make that suggestion is that if you have anything of your own in mind and will ask me the question direct, I will try and be perfectly frank and sincere with you, Senator.

Senator BORAH. No, Judge, I have not anything that I am not perfectly willing to divulge in the way of questions; but when I read in the paper that there was an issue involved in this matter which you deemed to be a moral issue, and that you would not arbitrate that matter with your men, I think in connection with thousands of others I was interested to know what you deemed, as a great employer of labor, that moral issue to be. You have now explained it, as I understand, to be the question of an open or a closed shop.

Mr. GARY. That was the answer as to what was the fundamental question.

Senator BORAH. Yes.

Mr. GARY. Now, as to the moral issue: I think it is immoral for a small minority of men, organized if you please, to compel by force a large majority to yield to their desires and to submit to their control. Because if the industries of this country or any other were controlled by union labor, as it would be if these gentlemen are successful—and I am not dealing in personalities—it would mean decay, less production higher cost; and this country could not succeed in its contest with other countries for the world's business, it would be in the condition that I fear England is in today, but which I hope it will come out of.

Now, I think when a few men, comparatively speaking, seek to impose their will to forcibly secure control of a business against the wishes of a large majority, that is immoral. That is my opinion of that. And here were outsiders, bear in mind, rank outsiders, who stated publicly away back at the St. Paul meeting, and it was testified to here before this committee, that they were starting out to organize the steel industry, which they had failed to accomplish in the past; that was their view; not for the purpose of securing better pay, better conditions; none of the twelve points which have been made since this strike was called, I think, was mentioned. We have never heard anything about those twelve points; none of our men have made any complaint; but these men were forcing themselves into the steel business, to unionize it all and to get control of it. And what would happen if they got control of it? Is there

any man here who has had any experience with organized labor who does not know? I could give you a good many instances—

Senator WALSH (interposing). What was there in the letter that this committee sent you which would lead you to believe that there was any issue of an open shop or a closed shop? Was it not simply a courteous letter saying that they desired an interview with you? And would not you be better before the country if you had received these men, and after they had raised this question to have then stated that there was this moral question involved, rather than to have anticipated that they meant this when there was only a friendly and courteous letter? It seems to me that you are on the defensive.

Mr. GARY. That is a fair question, Senator. The letter was a courteous letter, and I think my reply was courteous.

Senator WALSH. And no issue raised at all but a conference.

Mr. GARY. Remember, those gentlemen had publicly announced what they were proposing to do. They had notified me in advance what they were after.

Senator WALSH. Where and how?

Mr. GARY. In their public speeches.

Mr. LINDABURY. And the newspaper account of the Atlantic City meeting?

Mr. GARY. Yes, and the newspaper account of the Atlantic City meeting, their speeches in St. Paul, etc. When they said they represented our employees they overstated the situation.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Judge Gary, pardon me. Whom did you understand them to represent? It has been stated here that they represented some 24 international associations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Was that your understanding?

Mr. GARY. It was.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it your understanding that the American Federation of Labor, or any one of these international associations, is legally incorporated so as to form an entity with which an employer might enter into contract and enforce the terms of his contract?

Mr. GARY. My understanding is they were not incorporated. I do not know anything about it. Senator Walsh, I had not answered fully your other question yet.

Senator PHIPPS. But on the theory of the incorporation, would that—

Mr. GARY (interposing). I beg pardon.

Senator PHIPPS. The fact of whether or not an organization which sought to contract with employers was incorporated, would that have any bearing on the decision of the employer as to whether or not he would enter into a contract?

Mr. GARY. Well, Senator, I would like to ask if it is the practice of any of the labor unions to always keep their contracts after they make them, as far as that is concerned.

Senator PHIPPS. How can they be enforced if the labor organization is not incorporated?

Mr. GARY. They can not be enforced at all, of course.

Senator PHIPPS. That is one point.

Mr. GARY. That is one point; yes.

Senator PHIPPS. How about the danger to an employer who enters into a contract with a union representing his employees regarding the so-called sympathy strikes? Is there any manner, when he

enters into a contract, in which he can be protected against the dangers of a sympathy strike?

Mr. GARY. Not at all.

Senator WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move that we adjourn for five minutes to give Judge Gary a rest and in order that we may answer our roll call.

Mr. GARY. May I answer your question first, Senator Walsh? As it stands now I have not answered your question and I might seem to be discourteous.

Senator WALSH. The point I had in mind, Judge—and I want to repeat it—is the position you are in by reason of your refusal to meet these men in view of the courteous letter to you wherein they claimed, they claimed, to represent your employees. Now, if you have evidence and proof and facts to show that they made false statements to you on this, and that that is why you refused, I would like to know it.

Mr. GARY. As I said in my answer, I believed that they did not represent our men; and that was based upon very careful inquiry among our men.

Senator WALSH. They claimed in their letter they did.

Mr. GARY. I know they claim that, but that does not make it so. It has turned out since that their statement with regard to how many they represented and the number who had joined was not strictly accurate. Of course they got their information from some local organization, or however it is carried, and they are misinformed. But I should just like to tell you very frankly what I conceive to be—I won't say the danger—but the undesirability of conferring with or negotiating with labor union leaders as such.

Some time before this particular episode Mr. Tighe, a very worthy gentleman, as I presume, wrote me that he would like to confer with me, or perhaps have a committee of which he would be chairman confer with me, concerning our men. I am giving the substance of it, and of course the correspondence can be produced. I answered that, as he knew, we did not confer or negotiate with union labor leaders as such, although we did not combat them, and under those circumstances he must excuse me. I am giving the substance of it.

Now, Mr. Tighe did not publish that correspondence as I believe, and as I am informed. However, in a public statement—I do not mean a public statement; I think not a public statement perhaps, but in a statement in the nature of a report to his association, however it may be described, he stated the fact that he was in correspondence with me concerning the subject. I think that is as far as he went. I believe he wrote afterwards and told me that was as far as he went. He also wrote me that the newspapers had misrepresented him.

The newspapers, several of them, immediately stated that we had changed our policy, that we were in correspondence with Mr. Tighe, a well recognized and influential labor leader. The effect of that was, I think, bad upon the minds of our men. I have been informed that some of them joined the union in consequence of the fact that we had changed our opinion. Now, of course it is said by the union labor leaders that that shows one thing. I say it shows that they are watching to see what is going to be our attitude, so that if we are going to recognize unions they can immediately join. It seemed to me, therefore, to be an improper thing. I want to say that they already know—they have all known all the time—that we do not negotiate with union

labor leaders. This is no new thing; it is of long standing; they have all been told over and over again; they have sought conferences time and time again, and they have been denied. This was, as I think—and I say it good-naturedly—only the building up of a case for perhaps something to follow. I have no idea any of them expected that they would get into negotiation. As I said in my letter to our presidents, I have nothing against these gentlemen personally. I would meet them personally in a friendly way, and would be glad to, at any time and any place, but not as union labor leaders. Because it all comes back—

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me, Judge, but does that go to the extent of refusing to meet Mr. Gompers and talk over labor matters?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he wrote you, when he was on the stand here, and got no reply.

Mr. GARY. Yes; that was nothing new for him; he had requested conferences, covering a period of years.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are going to sit down at this conference next week with Mr. Gompers, are you not, and talk over labor matters? What is the difference?

Mr. GARY. I do not think I would meet those gentlemen as union labor leaders there.

The CHAIRMAN. Aren't you going to meet representatives of labor in this conference between capital and labor?

Mr. GARY. I will meet men who are union labor leaders just as I would meet our men in the shop; whether they belong to unions or not is immaterial, but we do not deal with them as unions. Because, as I have tried to show, Senator, it all comes back to the one proposition of recognizing and dealing with unions, thereby unionizing our shop, very much to the prejudice of employees, or of declining to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Granting that that may be true, does just having a conference do that? Is that a recognition of the union?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir, because they wrote me that they were representing unions, they gave the names of their lodges or associations right in their letter, and said they wanted to discuss questions relating to our men. I did not think that was just to our men. You must remember, gentlemen, that while it is my business to be courteous always, as I view it, as I understand it, to everyone under all circumstances, whether he is a friend or an enemy or what he is, at the same time I must be more than courteous to the large numbers of our own employees who are not union men, and who are opposed to unions, decidedly opposed to unions. I am not making any mistake about that. These gentlemen have not been able to unionize our men. We know what their feeling is perfectly well.

Senator BORAH. Mr. Gary, this matter all resolves itself then into the single issue, stripped of everything else, that your organization does not propose to deal with representatives of unions as representatives of unions for the reason that you conceive that that would destroy the principle of the open shop?

Mr. GARY. Yes, that is true in every respect.

Senator BORAH. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

Mr. GARY. Yes, that is a good statement of it.

Senator STERLING. Reading the names of the committee which addressed this letter to you, they are, John Fitzpatrick, David J. Davis, William Hannon, Edward J. Evans, and William Z. Foster. Were any of those men in the employ of your corporation or in the service of your corporation in any way whatsoever?

Mr. GARY. Not so far as I have ever heard. If they claim to be, I would be glad to have them tell me.

Senator WALSH. In your private affairs of life, when a dispute arose between you and another man about a contract, you would not refuse to see the attorney or representative of the other man with whom the contract was made, would you?

Mr. GARY. No, if he came to me as the attorney. In the first place I think—

Senator WALSH. If he came as a representative of the other man with whom you had a contract?

Mr. GARY. In the first place, I believe you are a member of the bar; I am sure you are, by reputation and ability and everything else. You know when a lawyer in good standing comes to you, he comes well recommended by reason of the fact that he is a lawyer; and if that lawyer says he represents a certain client, you are pretty sure he does. Now then, it happened that these gentlemen in my opinion did not represent our men, although they claimed to. I said politely, "I do not think you represent our men."

Senator BORAH. But, Judge, if they had represented your men, and represented them as a union, you could not have dealt with them?

Mr. GARY. You mean if all of our men, or a large majority of them, had belonged to a union? If you mean that, that is a different question, and I would not answer that in the negative.

Senator BORAH. As I understand your position it is this: That even if these men had represented the unionized men in your employ, even if they had, beyond question, had credentials from the unionized men, yet, because they were unionized, and because they represented a union, you would not have dealt with them?

Mr. GARY. You are wrong. I have not answered that, and I have not intended to answer that. If they had come to me and said, what I believed to be the fact, 15 per cent, even if it had been 15 per cent—I do not think it was over 10 per cent from my information—but if they said "We represent 15 per cent of your men, and because we represent 15 per cent of your men we should like to talk with you about that 15 per cent." I am not prepared to say that I would say "no" to that; I think I would have seen them.

Senator BORAH. But suppose they had said to you, Judge—and I am asking this question for the purpose of getting this issue, as I understand it, before the committee—suppose they had said to you that 15 per cent of your men had been unionized, and "As the representatives of those unions we come to discuss with you, as union men, certain questions," would you have met them?

Mr. GARY. I am not prepared to say I would not, Senator.

Senator BORAH. Well, if you had met them, that would have destroyed the proposition of the open shop?

Mr. GARY. No; I do not think it would. That might depend upon circumstances. By their request they disclaimed any representation of 85 per cent of our men, and the 85 per cent would know that,

and being aware of that fact would not be influenced, I think. Our 85 per cent are working side by side with 15 per cent who are members of a union; they have no controversy over it, all they want is an open shop; they say to the union men "Get all you can; we recognize that position, but do not interfere with our right to work in this shop." That is what the nonunion man says.

Senator BORAH. But the mere effect of your recognizing the representatives of the union at all would have had a tendency to drive other men into the union?

Mr. GARY. Perhaps, and perhaps not.

Senator BORAH. I understood that to be your position a few moments ago, but perhaps I was in error.

Mr. GARY. They came there claiming to represent our men.

Senator BORAH. May I ask another question, Judge?

Mr. GARY. Remember, this question you have propounded is one that has not been considered, one that has not arisen at all, and I am not prepared to commit myself for the future; but I certainly would not deny, under those circumstances, that I would meet those men. I would, however, have a distinct understanding, and there would be no opportunity left for the men in our mills to misunderstand the situation, that I was talking with them only as claiming to represent a small percentage.

Senator BORAH. The fact inherent to this controversy to such an extent as to control your mind, is that these men did not represent your employees at all, you felt that the men who offered to negotiate with you did not represent your men?

Mr. GARY. I do not think they did. I do not think they had been requested; I think they were laying out their own program; I do not think our men had asked them to represent them; I have no idea they did, because if our men were dissatisfied in any respect we would have heard of it, and if we were wrong we would have corrected it. Our men all know that; they all understand it thoroughly. These men were volunteers; outsiders entirely.

Senator BORAH. I quite agree with you, Judge; but if these men, to use a slang phrase, butted into this controversy and did not represent the employees, but were simply seeking to make trouble in your industry, you were under no obligation in the world to see them; but it seems to me, underlying that proposition, that would be a mere fact of this particular controversy, but underlying the proposition is the other question, as to whether or not great industries are willing to recognize the representatives of unionized labor, and to deal with them.

Mr. GARY. Senator, I should like to answer that question in just this way. We are not willing to do anything which we believe, after consideration, amounts to the establishment of a closed shop as against an open shop, or that tends to do that. We stand firmly on the proposition, that industry must be allowed to proceed untrammelled by the dictates of labor unions or anyone else except the employer and the employees and the Government. That is where we stand.

Senator BORAH. That is really the issue, as you conceive it to be, in this controversy?

Mr. GARY. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. You concede the public have some interest in that, do you not?



**Mr. GARY.** The highest, Senator. They are to be first considered. All private interests must yield to the public necessity and the public good.

**Senator McKellar.** When you spoke of the Government you meant the people?

**Mr. GARY.** I meant the people, of course.

**Senator Borah.** Without assuming to argue the question one way or the other, if labor can not deal with the great industries of the country collectively, do you think that it would be practical or practicable or possible for labor to maintain itself and its rights, its wages and so forth, as against combined capitalism? Can labor deal with capital without dealing with it in the same way, combined and collectively?

**Mr. GARY.** I think labor can deal collectively and it ought to be encouraged to deal collectively, and it ought not to be prohibited at any time from dealing collectively; but dealing collectively, in the form of committees, or however they themselves may decide, is one thing, and dealing collectively as insisted upon by the labor union leaders, which means that the union labor leaders shall decide all these questions, and shall represent the men, whether they are asked to or not, and will establish a basis for the closed shop which would shut out the individual voices of these men practically, is quite a different thing.

**Senator Jones (of New Mexico).** It has been claimed there is such intimidation that the men in your employ will not form their own committees to present their grievances. Have you anything to say about that?

**Mr. GARY.** I have this to say, that there is no foundation for the assertion, Senator. In September, 1916, I wrote to the presidents of the subsidiary companies, and, as I have said previously, I announce the policies of our corporation always and in my own way at various times. This goes back over a period of many years. There is one of the addresses I made to the presidents of our subsidiary companies on the labor question many, many years ago, perhaps several of them, but this is what I wrote our presidents in September, 1919.

**Senator Phipps.** Pardon me, but that letter has already been read into the record of this committee. I suggest this to save repetition. If you wish to make any comments or references to it, you may do so.

**Mr. GARY.** I thank you. I will not read it. I will just refer to one single phrase here [reading]:

It is appropriate to further emphasize what has been said many times in regard to our employees. Everyone, without exception, must be treated by all others justly and according to merit. In accordance with our established custom, one of our workmen, or a number of our workmen, from any department, will continue to be received by the management to consider for adjustment any question presented.

That is not a theory; it is a practice. It is a principle.

**Senator Jones (of New Mexico).** That is what I wanted to bring out, whether or not that was the actual working principle in your business. It has been intimated that these men, if they come with grievances, or attempt to organize, that they are in a sense black-listed, and that sooner or later some excuse is trumped up for their discharge.

Mr. GARY. Senator, there is no foundation in fact for that assertion. I know it has been made. Now, it is quite possible that a man, or more than one man, who is a member of a labor union, unknown to us or known to us—that is unimportant—has gotten up some proposition, has built up some straw man, for the purpose of making trouble, and of reporting that he was discriminated against because he was a union man. Or, it is possible, through I do not think probable, that some foreman may in some instance have shown some feeling against a union man when he discovered it. I do not know of any such case. It would be directly contrary to our orders, contrary to all our reports and contrary to the information I have. I have denied the proposition emphatically. It is not true.

Senator McKELLAR. You said a while ago, as I understood you, that you favored collective bargaining on the part of labor. Is that carried out in your shops, or what are the facts in reference to it?

Mr. GARY. The collective bargaining spoken of, some of those who have adopted a practice which is so referred to say that is really a misnomer. It is not important whether that is so or not. There has been adopted, commencing with the Colorado Fuel & Iron, two or three years ago, not to be specific, what I think they termed collective bargaining. Some of you, particularly Senator Phipps, will know more about that than I. Other companies, like the Midvale, the Youngstown Sheet & Tube and the Inland Steel, have adopted a form of shop committees, shop committee work. Now, we are watching those with a great deal of interest, a great deal of concern. One of the propositions of the labor unions, one of the 12 demands, is that they shall be abolished, and those who have adopted the shop committee plan say it is because it interferes with labor unions, that labor unions can not succeed with that as a substitute. Some of the men, I understand, have been dissatisfied with them in some respects, I do not know what, but I do know the Colorado Fuel men are out on strike now, or part of them at least, and also some of the Bethlehem, I do not know how many: they say a small number; others claim a large number. Practically all of the Midvale people at Cambria, 15,000 men, are out. The Inland Steel men are all out; and it would seem there may be dissatisfaction on the part of some of them; that is a part of those men at least have joined labor unions and have heeded the call. I know nothing about it, although it is reported to us that those men, in large numbers, are now anxious to get back and are trying to get back into the shops, but are prohibited by the strikers. I presume that is so, because at Johnstown we have some small works, not important compared with others, where these Midvale people, these Cambria plant people, are coming around every day and encircling our plant, doing everything they can to drive our men out. And, as you know, all through this strike men have been assaulted, some shot down by intimidators. I do not know who they are; I am not making personal accusations; I do not know; but it is pursuant to the plan.

Now, Senator, if these plans do prove to be successful, a benefit to the men and satisfactory to the men, and they want them, we will probably adopt something of the kind.

We are consulting our men. We are not getting up a plan and putting it to our men and saying "This is the plan you must adopt." We are not getting up a program of any kind and forcing it on our

men anywhere. We try to find out what our men really want, and then if it is practicable and just put it into effect. We were not asked during the last few years to increase the wages of our men at any time, as far as I know not a single time; and we increased them over and over again. Why? Because we thought they were entitled to it on the merits. We have always done that. We have stood for the highest wages invariably. We have been the first to increase wages and the last to decrease them. In fact, I think we have decreased our wages but once since our company was organized in 1901, and we have increased them 10 or a dozen or 15 times; and as I have shown, they have been trebled—and on the merits. Consequently we have not had much if any complaint from our men. If you would like to hear it, I could tell you in a very few words of an experience that occurred not long ago, that would have some bearing on the subject. It may be tedious, Senator—

Senator WALSH. We are very much interested.

Senator PHIPPS. Pardon me. There are one or two points that I would like to bring out first, if I may.

It has been claimed by witnesses before this committee that the opposition of the Steel Corporation to organized labor extended to that point where the corporation several years ago had made a large appropriation for the purpose of destroying the union. Have you anything to say on that?

Mr. GARY. I have. A witness stated that we had established a fund of from \$1,000,000 to \$20,000,000 to drive out unions. First, I want to say we never established a fund of one cent, or any fund, for that purpose, not one penny. The statement is absolutely untrue. When our company started business April 1, 1901, we found that a number of the subsidiary companies were dealing with labor unions, were contracting with them, with organized labor, and others were not; and after full discussion we decided we would leave that question where it was, that where the subsidiary companies had been contracting with union labor we would continue to contract with them, and where they had not we would not contract with them.

Now, 3 or 4 months after that a strike was called and all our men were called out; some responded. There was an effort then to organize all of our corporations, and within a comparatively short time it failed. The men came back voluntarily; they did not ask for anything; they were not granted anything, not a thing; wages were not increased. The Illinois Steel Company, for instance—they were members of the union—came back and refused to obey the orders of the union, and they were expelled from the general association.

Now, then, going on from time to time, members of unions began to withdraw; the payment of dues was obnoxious, they were not getting anything in their unions that the other men did not get without union. They were treated precisely the same in all companies all the time and they began withdrawing, and withdrew one after another. They say we got rid of them. Nothing of the sort. That is not true. It is not true in the main—if there were any exceptions I do not know, but I will not say there were no exceptions to that rule, because that might be too specific to be absolutely certain of my ground. Our orders were positive, and we made a record of that, and our companies were notified. It finally came down to one company, as

I remember, one manufacturing company, and that was the Tin Plate Company, with a plant at Bridgeport, Ohio.

The men in that shop who belonged to the union reported frequently that they would like to get rid of the unions, they were not of benefit to them, and they would like to get out, and they hoped we would not contract with the unions, so they could work without being members of the unions. We declined to interfere and made our contract for the year just the same, living up to our resolution. Finally, it was reported to us that we were being discriminated against; the president of one of our subsidiary companies reported that while our competitors in business had made contracts with unions for labor, the same as we had, and we were living up to it, and, therefore, restricting the output as provided in the contract, our competitors were making more, exceeding the minimum named in the contract, and therefore to our prejudice.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you finished on that point, Judge Gary?

Mr. GARY. I have not quite finished, Senator, but pretty nearly. And I am sorry that I am taking up so much of your time.

Senator PHIPPS. The Senators have all the time in the world to hear you.

Mr. GARY. Thereupon, at the request of that president, we said, "Very well, bring us the proof of that." They did. They brought us many affidavits from the working men in these different mills showing they had exceeded the amount of tonnage provided in our contract, and, as we assumed, in their contract. Then the president asked leave to put up a notice that after July 1, I believe it was, anyhow after the expiration of the existing contract that the mills would be run after that time as an open shop. And that was done. At that time the men were called out and they went out, and almost immediately they began asking to come back. They came back in large numbers until the mill was filled, and then they were slugged going back and forth, several of them beaten up, assaulted in the streets, and I think some were shot, although, according to my recollection, none was killed.

We went to the mayor of the city and asked for police protection—some of our people did—and the mayor said he could not do it, he was not on that side. Then they went to the court, and the court issued an injunction against the unlawful actions of the strikers or whoever they were, these few people. The writ was put in the hands of a deputy at Bridgeport, but he would not serve the writ. And thereupon the mill was closed down, and these men at their request, a large majority of them, were given employment at other mills in the same lines of business, and they continued at work in the other mills where many of them have been ever since.

That was the last, I think, of making contracts with unions. If I have in any respect misstated the facts it is unintentional. I have stated them in accordance with my recollection of what occurred at the time; it was several years ago.

Senator PHIPPS. I would like to ask if you have any information as to the voting of an appropriation at any time by the American Federation of Labor in a large amount for the purpose of organizing the workmen in the steel corporation's plants, and if you can give the approximate date and the amount.

Mr. GARY. I am sorry, I can not give you the data. I have read, however, of the circumstance.

Senator WALSH. Have you a secret-service organization among your employees at any of the subsidiary plants of the Steel Corporation?

Mr. GARY. Well, Senator, I can not be very specific about that, but I am quite sure that at times some of our people have used secret-service men to ascertain facts and conditions.

Senator WALSH. Now, there are two other questions—

Mr. GARY (interrupting). That is intended to be at least a frank answer, and perhaps it is over frank.

Senator WALSH. Now there are two other questions I would like to ask you. The first is, every superintendent and every foreman in the subsidiary companies knows your attitude and the attitude of the finance committee toward labor organizations or unions; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. Well, I think so. As I stated here—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). And don't you think that fact has some influence in the fixing of pleasant or unpleasant relations between your employees, who are members of unions, and their foremen?

Mr. GARY. I do not think so. On the contrary I know that the relations are very good and very pleasant, even since the strike. I have been told of instances where the strikers and the superintendent of the mills were playing baseball at one of the striking places and having a good time together during the day. There is no feeling of enmity generally.

Senator WALSH. And I would like to ask you if the reason why you have informed your superintendents and foremen of your attitude and the attitude of the committee toward the labor organizations or unions, is because you do not believe in labor organizations. That is it, isn't it? Otherwise you would not notify them and given them—

Mr. GARY (interrupting). No.

Senator WALSH. Well, do you or do you not believe in labor organizations?

Mr. GARY. If you mean whether I believe they are beneficial to the community—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). To the workmen themselves.

Mr. GARY. Well, no—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). No. That answers it. You do not.

Mr. GARY. No; that is your answer, not mine. Excuse me. I will not deny that labor unions may be a good thing in places and at times and to a certain extent as tending to protect labor, the interests of labor. I will not deny that. But I do deny that the universal practice of labor unions, labor unions carried to the extent which permits outsiders, agitators, or anybody else, to universally establish the closed shop, is inimical to the best interests of the employees and of the general public. Now, then, you draw your own conclusions as to whether that means I do or do not believe in them.

Senator WALSH. The conclusion that I draw is that you have no objection to labor organizations among your employees in your subsidiary plants. Am I correct?

Mr. GARY. As their own organization?

Senator WALSH. As their own organization.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. But they should not affiliate themselves with the American Federation of Labor or any other organization; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. Or any organization that tends to unionize industry universally.

Senator WALSH. Now, I suppose you will agree——

Mr. GARY (interrupting). I think that is sufficient.

Senator WALSH. Now, I suppose you will agree that there has been no force in America that has done more to shorten the hours of labor——

Mr. GARY. To do what?

Senator WALSH. To increase wages, to better living conditions of the workmen, than organizations of labor.

Mr. GARY. I deny it positively, emphatically. I want to say that the United States Steel Corporation has been in the van all the time——

Senator WALSH. But I am speaking very generally and not about your organization. Has it not been because of the pressure upon legislators of organized labor bodies that has brought about the child labor laws, that has brought about the cutting down of the hours of labor for women and children, that has brought about the eight-hour working day, that has brought about the increases of wages, that has brought about better sanitary conditions and better home living conditions? Is not that the great factor that has been brought to bear upon the public that has influenced public opinion and also influenced public legislation? Has not that been the labor organizations?

Mr. GARY. I want to tell you, on the contrary, Senator, that where the labor unions have advocated these things you speak of they have followed the established practice of the United States Steel Corporation, as a rule.

Senator WALSH. I have been speaking generally of the progress made in the last 25 years in the condition of the workingman in America, and I ask you whether or not you agree with the proposition that the influence of organized labor has been a potent and a great factor in bringing about this improved condition?

Mr. GARY. At times they may have been factors in improving conditions. I would not intentionally do an injustice to anybody, but I still insist the steel industry has been ahead of them all the time, and that our men, the employees of the steel industry in this country, do not belong to labor unions because they think they have been treated better than those who work under the closed-shop practice.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Gary, do you mean to say that the steel industry has led the labor of the country in the eight-hour day? Go back to this investigation in 1911 with which you are familiar.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. According to this report——

Mr. GARY (interposing). What report?

The CHAIRMAN. Men were mostly working seven days a week and twelve hours a day.

Mr. GARY. What report is it?

The CHAIRMAN. The report of conditions of employment in the iron and steel industry.

Mr. GARY. By whom?

The CHAIRMAN. Made by the Department of Labor, under direction of Congress. Have these figures been denied?

Mr. GARY. I do not think so, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you had the seven days a week and ten and twelve hours a day. In what were you leading?

Mr. GARY. Senator, I do not say we had adopted eight hours before anybody else.

The CHAIRMAN. But you hold the Steel Company up as the leader in all of these great reforms?

Mr. GARY. That brings up this whole question of hours; and let me tell you, in regard to that, the question of hours has been largely a question of wishes, of desire on the part of the employees themselves. The union labor leaders have not advocated that because they were attempting to benefit workers at their request, in my judgment, not as a rule at least. The question of hours involves the question of compensation. We had that seven-day work for a great many years. At one of our stockholders meetings a gentleman, a worker, spoke publicly on that subject. He said, "The employers did not inaugurate that. That was done by the employees, and I was one of them that started it." Why? Because he wanted more compensation. We, however, decided to eliminate the seven-day week labor if we possibly could.

Senator McKEILLAR. When was that?

The CHAIRMAN. When did you do that?

Mr. GARY. That was a number of years ago; and we practically eliminated it. At times and places there were strikes because that was inaugurated, because the compensation was decreased.

Now, the war came on and the Government was clamoring for more and more steel all the time. They were very much frightened at one time because they feared there would not be enough for our country and its associates, and they were insisting upon more and more production and more and more days of work; and the men themselves, of course, were anxious to get into it because the compensation was increased. It was not until after the armistice of November 11, 1918, that Secretary of War Baker, through Riley, Adjutant General. I think, someone of that name, Adjutant General, wrote:

-The Secretary of war directs me to notify you to stop all Sunday work, overtime, and night work on Government contracts, effective immediately.

In case your bureau desires an exception made for some particular contract or article, you will at once state the circumstances with recommendations.

And we immediately put that into practice just as fast as we could.

Senator PHIPPS. Judge Gary, will you kindly give us the practice prevailing in normal times, say just before the war, taken in 1911, what were the hours per day and days per week?

Mr. GARY. Sunday work was practically eliminated, except as to the blast furnaces, which are required to be continuously operated,

operated without interruption; and in those cases we reduced the days per week, not giving all of them Sunday, but giving each employee one day during the week, whether it was Sunday or another day. That was our practice with regard to that. Now, with respect to compensation—

Senator PHIPPS (interposing). Pardon me a moment.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. One important element there is whether or not the 8-hour day had been generally instituted where that was practicable, or not; whether you were then, in 1914, adhering to the 12-hour day.

Mr. GARY. You mean whether we had adopted that? I do not remember exactly when we adopted the 8-hour basic day. The employees generally do not want 8 hours; I do not want you to think that for a moment.

Senator PHIPPS. It is the 8-hour basic day that I am referring to.

Mr. GARY. That we put into practice at a time when some of our men made known the fact that they would like to have an 8-hour basic day, which means, as you know, the regular price per hour for 8 hours and then time and a half over that, so that the 12-hour men, for instance, get the full rate for the 12 hours and half of the full rate for the extra 4 hours, which, of course, makes very good compensation.

Now, then, I want to say, because this question has been up several times with reference to hours, I think there is a large portion of the public that believes in the 8 hours, and on the ground that that is long enough for a man to work out of the 24. I believe that. And I believe there are a good many employees—I do not say a majority or anything like a majority, but there are a good many employees who believe the same thing. We are very carefully considering that question. Of course, if we should immediately limit the hours to 8 and pay for the 8 hours the same that these men are getting for 10 or 12, every employee would favor it, naturally. And an employee is always entitled to insist upon whatever he thinks he ought to have, and we find no fault with regard to that. We might not always grant his request if it seemed to be unreasonable. But I want to say this, that, as a matter of policy and principle, if we can make it practicable to adopt 8 hours throughout our works universally, and the men themselves are willing to accept that basis, we would be very glad to adopt it, for the reason, if for no other, that we think there is a strong public sentiment in favor of it. And I would not be put on record here or any other place as opposing the 8-hour basis if the men themselves want it and will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, that is because of the public sentiment, largely?

Mr. GARY. Partly so, and partly because I think some of the men prefer it. It is not an admitted fact that more than 8 hours are too much for a man to labor per day. I have already said I had my own experience in that regard; and all our officers, the president of our company and all of our presidents worked up from the ranks, I think practically every one of them, on their merit. They came up from day laborers, being promoted on account of their merit from place to place and from time to time. They were all perfectly satisfied with their time of service; they all desired to work longer hours.



What are the farmers going to do if you limit it to eight hours? You have perhaps got an answer to that. They can not limit their work to eight hours and survive. What are many other lines of industry going to do? I talked with the barber this morning, or he talked to me, as barbers generally do when they are operating, and he said—I presume he knew who I was, although he did not say so—he said, “I see they are having a big strike nowadays.” He said, “I do not believe in strikes and I do not believe in labor unions; I have worked for 30 years 12 and 14 hours a day, and I could not afford to work less.” That is the way workmen quite frequently feel.

The labor leaders will deny that; and they are sincere, quite likely; I do not dispute their sincerity, but the average workmen do not agree.

THE CHAIRMAN. I asked you a question and I think you wandered away from it, lawyer like, but not judge like.

MR. GARY. Excuse me; that is quite likely.

THE CHAIRMAN. You said, as I understood you, that you took the public into consideration as to the 8-hour day.

MR. GARY. I said that had an influence.

THE CHAIRMAN. What the feeling was amongst the public?

MR. GARY. Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN. And so you have, have you not, in this controversy taken the public into consideration?

MR. GARY. Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN. Who do you recognize to represent the public—the President of the United States?

MR. GARY. Well, you know, there are two political parties. One party claims that he does not and the other that he does. I have a very high opinion of him myself.

THE CHAIRMAN. But at the present time the President represents the public, does he not? When you speak of the public there is no other way for the public to be represented unless it is through Congress.

MR. GARY. He is at the head of the Nation.

THE CHAIRMAN. Now it has been charged here by one of the witnesses, and I ask that in view of your statement that you took into consideration the public, that in the interest of the public the President requested you to meet these men and have a conference, and that you declined to do it? Is that correct?

MR. GARY. Don't you think you should get that information, the answer to that question, whatever it is, from him rather than me?

THE CHAIRMAN. If I did I should not have asked you the question. I do not see—is there any secret about it?

MR. GARY. Well, ask him.

Senator BORAH. I agree with you that he does not necessarily represent the public at all.

Senator MCKELLAR. He did not say that. He said quite the contrary. He said he recognized him as representing the public.

MR. GARY. He stands at the head of the Nation.

THE CHAIRMAN. Do you decline to state?

MR. GARY. I do not, if it is insisted upon; no.

THE CHAIRMAN. If you object to it, then of course it is a matter for the committee to take up.

Mr. GARY. I rather think you ought not to ask me that. I think it is a delicate question. I think anything that transpires between the President and a private individual ought not to be stated by the individual without the consent of the President.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that a question of strikes in industries that affect two or three hundred thousand men is entirely a private question?

Mr. GARY. Certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then why—

Mr. GARY (interrupting). I do not believe your question is germane to the inquiry that you have previously made, as I view it. I may be wrong, Senator. Certainly strike matters are of public interest, of the highest public interest.

I believe the sentiment of this country is largely in favor of the open shop as against the closed shop. I certainly believe that, and if I did not—if you could convince me to the contrary, Senator—

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with you.

Mr. GARY (continuing). It would have a very great influence on our action, I assure you.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with you as to the closed shop and the open shop. There is no quarrel about that.

Mr. GARY. You say you agree with me?

The CHAIRMAN. I do.

Mr. GARY. You are in favor of the open shop?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARY. I am mighty glad to hear that, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. But that is not the point here. The question is the question of conference; the question of the President's action with respect to requesting you to have a conference.—

Mr. GARY. My opinion is that a conference is a step in the direction of the closed shop, a decided step, a long step. I may be wrong about that, but that is my opinion.

The Chairman. In making any request of you the President certainly did not make any request about the closed and open shop. If he was making any request of you I assume it was for a conference.

Mr. GARY. I have not said that he did or did not.

The CHAIRMAN. No. But other witnesses have said he did.

Mr. GARY. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. Other witnesses have said he did—whether they had authority to say that or not I do not know—that he requested you to have a conference with these men, and you refused to grant it.

Mr. GARY. There is not a thing about any communications between the President and myself at any time that I am not perfectly willing to divulge; but, as a matter of propriety, as a matter of etiquette, it seems to me, although I may have an exaggerated idea with reference to it, that such communications ought to be disclosed by the President himself. It seems to me that it would be more respectful if I assumed that attitude. I am not insinuating there is any mystery of any sort or description in anything the President has ever said to me or that I have ever said to him, but I base it on that one ground, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn for lunch at this point and think about it in the meantime.

(Thereupon, at 1.05 o'clock, a recess was taken until 2.30 o'clock of the same day.)

## AFTER RECESS.

## STATEMENT OF MR. E. H. GARY—Resumed.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I take the opportunity to put in just a few figures? It will take but a very short time.

I want to say, first, that we have expended for residences to rent to our workmen, or in some cases to sell to our workmen if they desire to buy, \$32,000,000; and have appropriated seven millions more, not yet expended, but in process of expenditure.

Senator McKELLAR. On what terms do you sell to your workmen?

Mr. GARY. Any terms, almost, that they ask for.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you not some general rule under which you sell to the employees; and if so, what is that?

Mr. GARY. We may have a rule of paying 10 per cent down, but if the workman wants to pay less we will take it. Of course, we accommodate them. We rent those houses for 1 or 2 per cent on our investment, I think, on the average.

Now, let me say, with reference to the housing conditions of employees; of course, we do not control them. The workmen may live where they please. We can only offer them the chance. In some cases some of the foreigners prefer to secure their own places of residence and save their money and take it home—take it abroad. You have seen the figures published in the papers of the amount of money taken during the last two or three years by foreigners back to Europe. I have not the figures exactly in my mind, but they are up in the hundreds of millions, as I remember, a very large sum. Of course, that is not objectionable from our standpoint at all.

Senator McKELLAR. Judge Gary, have you those figures, about how much has been taken? If so, we would be glad to have that put into the record here.

Mr. GARY. I think I can get them.

Senator McKELLAR. If so, we would be glad to put them in the record here.

Mr. GARY. I can get them from governmental sources, I think. Mr. Frank, I think it is, at Pittsburgh, I notice gave an interview to one of the papers the other day in which he referred to the charges that the living conditions in the Steel Corporation were bad, and then goes on to say that we could not control that; and if there are any such, which he does not know of, that it certainly could not be our fault; and then said that he had built a number of houses that cost him a certain sum of money, had rented them on a basis of 2 per cent interest on his investment, and four or five of them had been rented, I think he said to Italians, and they had sublet to individuals, so that they were filled with people, I think as many as 12 or 14 men in one four-room house; and, of course, they were making money out of it, but it was not his fault. That is only an illustration. I should say that the rent which we are receiving on the houses we have provided has not been increased in amount since 1914, since the war commenced.

Senator STERLING. May I ask, Mr. Gary, the kind of houses you have built for sale or rent to your men?

Mr. GARY. We have pictures of them here. There are a lot of them, and you probably will not take the time to look at them all. I would like to leave them.

Senator STERLING. The number of rooms, for example?

Mr. GARY. Four, five, and six rooms. The six rooms rent for more than the five, and the five more than the four.

The CHAIRMAN. How much of that money has been paid back, of these millions that you have used?

Mr. GARY. Oh, those who purchased have generally paid. There may be in the whole lot two cases, or possibly three, where they are behind in their payments, but they have not defaulted. There might be a case of sickness, or something of that kind, it might be because at some particular time there was not work in the particular department for the men, but of course we would not take advantage of that and never have.

Now, we have paid out for welfare work, from 1912 to the first six months of 1919, inclusive, \$65,868,707.09; and I have the details of those figures, which I would be very glad to submit to your committee. Welfare, sanitation, accident prevention, relief for injured men and families of men killed—you know, we have a voluntary accident relief plan; that is, we pay, no matter whose fault it is; and you know probably what we are doing in regard to the prevention of accidents.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you have a retiring scheme for old age?

Mr. GARY. Yes, we have a pension plan. If a man has been in the service 25 years, and is 65 years old, he may retire on a certain percentage of his salary. I would be glad to leave that plan with you.

Senator McKELLAR. I wish you would.

(The statement referred to will be found printed in full at the end of this day's proceedings.)

Mr. GARY. It is very liberal. Welfare, ten million seven hundred and twenty-one odd thousand dollars; sanitation, ten million and some odd thousand; accident prevention, five million nine hundred and sixty-one odd thousand dollars; relief for injured men and the families of men killed, twenty million nine hundred and fifteen odd thousand; the employees stock subscription plan—that is, the 25 points for the stock in five years, as already explained.

Mr. LINDABURY. The Steel Corporation's contribution?

Mr. GARY. Yes. The Steel Corporation contributes 25 points on that stock to the employees, five points a year. The amount is eight million four hundred and sixty thousand. For pension fund payments, in excess of income provided by the permanent fund, which is twelve million dollars, four millions of which Mr. Carnegie contributed, and eight millions of which we contributed—that amount is one million seven hundred forty-eight odd thousand dollars.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you require any of your employees to pay anything on the retirement fund?

Mr. GARY. We do not.

Senator McKELLAR. The Corporation pays it all?

Mr. GARY. Pays it all. Up to date it is large and increasing.

That makes a total of sixty-five millions; that is from 1912 to the first six months of 1919, inclusive.

Senator WALSH. Do you insure your own help against accident?

Mr. GARY. No, we do not.

Senator WALSH. Do you do that through the insurance companies?

Mr. GARY. No.

Senator WALSH. You do it yourself?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. And you have your own workmen's compensation department?

Mr. GARY. Yes; and we inaugurated or adopted that before the State laws came into force.

Mr. LINDABURY. It happens to be the model of most or all the State laws.

Senator WALSH. Before the Wisconsin law, which was the first?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. What year was it?

Mr. GARY. And the States largely copied our plan.

Senator WALSH. What year was that?

Mr. REID. 1909.

Mr. GARY. 1909, I think.

Senator McKELLAR. How long has your retirement rule been in effect?

Mr. GARY. The pension plan?

Senator McKELLAR. The pension plan.

Mr. GARY. Since 1911.

I do not know whether you would consider this appropriate, and I am not going to read it, but here are printed remarks of something I said to the presidents of our companies in December, 1913, at one of our regular presidents' meetings in the due course of business. It only shows my attitude and the attitude of the corporation toward our employees, given the presidents instructions in regard to that. It will read it if you desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to put it into the record?

Mr. GARY. Yes; I would like to put it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take all speeches here but the League of Nations.

Senator McKELLAR. If you make a good one we will put that in.

Mr. LINDABURY. Here is a telegram I would like to put in the record if the chairman will permit. It is as follows.

(Mr. Lindabury read a telegram, but after discussion it was agreed it should not go in the record.)

Mr. GARY. I have thousands of letters and telegrams like that from all over the South, and from chambers of commerce and private individuals, and many women, and from our stockholders, and many of our employees. Of course, all this is very gratifying, but I would not expect to burden the record with them.

Here is a letter written August 30, 1918, from Mr. Frederick L. Hoffman, third vice president and statistician of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America. I would like to put this in the record, stating in substance that this gentleman made a very extensive visit to our various plants, and having examined the plants, the properties, the housing conditions, the sanitation and hygiene, etc., etc., it is very extensive, he commends it in detail as the best he has ever seen.

Senator McKELLAR. Which plants did he visit?

Mr. GARY. This particular one is the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., at Birmingham. We have there perhaps as fine a hospital—I will not say it is as fine as any in the United States, but it is one of the best. It cost over a million dollars and is a splendid hospital.

Senator McKELLAR. Built by the company?

Mr. GARY. Built by the company. Each company has a chief surgeon and a corps of assistants, and we furnish medical attendance to our employees and their families. We furnish nurses and do all sorts of things in that direction.

Senator STERLING. Is that free of charge to the employees?

Mr. GARY. All free of charge, and where we build the villages and there is colored labor we establish a village for the colored people and another village near there for the white people. They prefer to live in separate villages, as those of you who are from the South know, and they are accommodated.

There is here also a letter from this same Dr. Hoffman, dated June 18, 1918, in regard to the decrease in the rates of insurance; that is, the premiums on life insurance to the men from 1908 to 1919.

(The two letters from Dr. Hoffman referred to, are as follows:)

THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,  
Home Office, Newark, N. J., August 30, 1918.

Mr. C. L. CLOSE,

*Manager Bureau of Safety, Sanitation and Welfare.*

*United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York City.*

DEAR MR. CLOSE: My answer to your letter of July 30 has been unduly delayed on account of absence from office. I owe you an apology for not having written to you immediately on our return from the South, but I have been away almost continuously. Capt. Sand and I were given every opportunity for as thorough an investigation as could possibly be made within the limitations of time. Much to our regret, Mr. Crawford was away, but we were well taken care of by Dr. Noland. We not only examined into the housing plans and conditions, but we were also shown through a large portion of the steel works. Capt. Sand was delighted with the privileges extended to him, and I had hoped that he would have had time before leaving for England to write to you personally, as well as to Mr. Crawford, but on his return to New York he found that his mission had failed, and he followed within a day or two thereafter and without opportunity to write to those who had been so courteous and considerate toward him.

Briefly, the work of your company in the Birmingham district is one of the most remarkable contributions to the ultimate solution of the labor problem of which I have knowledge. That problem, as I conceive it, involves no more and no less than the whole question of contentment, or absence of friction, on the part of the employee with any and all conditions giving unnecessary occasion for irritation, discomfort, etc. Now, of all that concerns laborers, there is nothing as vital as the houses in which they live, and the surroundings that go with them, and the conditions of family life that depend upon them. Your company, under your direction, has taken hold of this question with a thoroughness rarely met with in this country. Familiar as I am with what has been done by the Krupps at Essen, and by other large employers of labor in Germany, and by a number of large corporations in England, as, for illustration, at Port Sunlight, or at York, I am absolutely satisfied that your efforts are on a distinctly higher plane, and bound, in course of time, to produce more satisfactory and lasting results.

Capt. Sand and I were particularly pleased with the high order of intelligence on the part of your welfare workers, including the teachers whom we met and their associates. They reflected a practical idealism and common sense viewpoint, than which there is nothing of greater importance in efforts of this kind. I unfortunately have not my notes with me so as to be able to give the names, but you will know to whom I have reference. We were amazed at the amount of Red Cross work being done by the women in the community and their well-

directed efforts in the broader field of war charities. We were delighted with what is being done for the children, the admirable playgrounds provided for them, the excellent school facilities, the wholesome atmosphere surrounding the schoolhouses, the insistence upon personal hygiene, etc.

As regards the housing plans, or rather the villages themselves, they could not very well have been laid out in a more admirable manner considering the topography, natural drainage, natural surroundings, proximity to work places, etc. Such of the houses as we inspected indicated a sufficient regard for room space and a distinctly higher level of domestic comfort than is ordinarily met with in the housing accommodations for factory workers. In fact, throughout, it is obvious that you are aiming at a provision for home life rather than for mere housing, and that is, after all, the most vital distinction to be made in matters of this kind.

The provision for gardening is reasonably sufficient, though, of course, more could be done, but it may be questioned whether near as much is being done anywhere else. I know how difficult it is to secure the hearty cooperation of the people themselves in the keeping of the premises, the raising of fowls, vegetables, etc., but you seem to have succeeded quite beyond ordinary expectations.

As far as we could learn, the rentals were decidedly moderate, and while we did not go into the question of wages, and the relation thereto of rents and the cost of living generally, it was made very apparent to Capt. Sand and myself that in all probability the workmen in the Birmingham district have a larger amount of surplus available for comfort and luxuries than in perhaps any other section of the country. That this is so is largely in consequence of the provisions made by your company for housing, etc., on a broad scale and upon the basis of well considered plans, instead of the usual procedure of each and every one acting for himself, usually upon ill-considered advice and without regard to the neighborhood requirements.

What pleased us most, however, was the fact that your company disregards racial lines and aims in its home and housing provisions to provide the same comforts and surroundings for the Negroes as for the whites. The contribution which you are making in this respect to the so-called race problem, may, in the course of years, have more important influence, in my judgment, than what is being done by Hampton or Tuskegee. After all, there are no impressions more enduring upon the plastic minds of the young than those of early childhood spent midst pleasing and even impressive home surroundings. Nothing has hindered the Negro as much as the deliberate policy on the part of the whites to provide him continuously with housing accommodations frequently unworthy of the name. While some progress has been made from the one-room cabin to one of two or more rooms, your company is the first, to my knowledge, which is providing a real home life on equality with the conditions under which the best white element lives for those of the colored race.

Much to my regret, I can not further enlarge upon this matter for I am about to leave my office on an urgent appointment. I must not, however, omit to express my very high personal regard for the professional ability of Dr. Noland, and his far-sighted viewpoint of all the important questions which we discussed with him and which bear directly upon the health and the conservation of the physical strength of the working people in the Birmingham district. The new hospital which is in course of building will undoubtedly become one of the notable institutions in the South. The plan of Dr. Noland to train colored nurses should prove a far-reaching innovation, of benefit to both the white and the colored, but particularly to the latter in further raising the intellectual and moral status of the race and in establishing professional pride, which is the first basis of all lasting social progress. What the Army is doing on the one hand for the colored race, you are doing on the other. You may not be satisfied with the results for many years, and you may suffer much disappointment in one direction or another, but you can not but be conscious of an extraordinary effort on the part of your company, governed by the highest consideration of national and individual welfare worthy of being followed not only in this country but throughout the world.

For these and many other reasons it was most gratifying to me to have Capt. Sand with me, and to have him carry back later on to his afflicted country the principles of social and economic reconstruction which underlie all of the welfare work of the Steel Corporation. He agrees with me that the fundamental problem in the relation of capital to labor is to remove any and every substantial reason for resentment based upon clear perceptions of injustice or indifference on the part of those who have the power to do what is

right, but who so frequently lack the moral impulse to live up to their understandings.

I make use of this opportunity to thank you once more for the exceptional kindness extended to us on the part of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., and I am sure I voice the regret of Capt. Sand that we could not have met Mr. Crawford personally, but we are very grateful to Dr. Noland and his associates for all that he did for us during the one day, which, I am sure, will linger in the memory of Capt. Sand long after most of his other impressions regarding America and the life and the labor of our people have been forgotten.

I remain,

Very truly, yours,

F. L. HOFFMAN,  
Third Vice President and Statistician.

THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,  
Home Office, Newark, N. J., June 18, 1918.

Mr. C. L. CLOSE,

Manager Bureau of Safety, Sanitation, and Welfare,  
United States Steel Corporation 71 Broadway, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. CLOSE: You and I have occasionally discussed the remarkable progress in safety and sanitation in steel plants and steel towns. The evidence concerning accident prevention, and the safety movement in general, is presented in an excellent summary form for the period 1907-1917 in a recent report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but to do full justice to the subject would require a series of volumes.

As you know, I have made investigations into this subject for many years, largely because of our interest in the question as to the justice and equity of extra premium charges in hazardous occupations. We have always assumed a conservative attitude, with a due regard to the full protection of the interests of all our policyholders. Our investigations from time to time, however, have clearly shown the urgency and justice of a reduction in our premium charges even in the case of the most hazardous occupations. It therefore affords me much pleasure to be able to furnish you with the following statement showing our practice in 1908, and the present practice based upon a recent and further revision of our rates. To avoid unnecessary complexity I have limited the comparison to rates charged, stage 35, on a whole life policy for \$1,000. The results are as follows:

*Prudential extra ratings in principal occupations of the iron and steel industry, 1918 and 1919.*

(\$1,000 whole life policy, age 35.)

	1908	1919
<b>Blast furnace:</b>		
Blower.....	<sup>1</sup> \$13.22	<sup>(3)</sup>
Keeper.....	<sup>1</sup> 13.22	<sup>2</sup> \$2.77
Stove tenders, gas washer, keepers' helpers, cinder snapper, tuyere man, water tender.....	<sup>1</sup> 12.22	<sup>4</sup> 5.67
<b>Bessemer plant:</b>		
Cupola melter, liner, vessel man, ladle man, stopper setter.....	<sup>1</sup> 13.22	<sup>4</sup> 5.67
Blowers and regulators.....	<sup>2</sup> 2.96	<sup>3</sup> 2.77
<b>Open hearth plant:</b>		
Melter.....	<sup>1</sup> 13.22	<sup>3</sup> 2.77
Melter's first, second, third helpers.....	<sup>1</sup> 13.22	<sup>4</sup> 5.67
<b>Crucible steel plant:</b>		
Melter.....	<sup>1</sup> 13.22	<sup>3</sup> 2.77
Pot filler, shaker, pourer, moulder, lifter.....	<sup>1</sup> 13.22	<sup>4</sup> 5.67
<b>Rolling mills:</b>		
Roller.....	<sup>3</sup> 2.96	<sup>(3)</sup>
Soaking pit heater.....	<sup>3</sup> 5.92	<sup>2</sup> 2.77

<sup>1</sup> Hazardous.

<sup>2</sup> Regular.

<sup>3</sup> Special.

<sup>4</sup> Medium.

<sup>Int.</sup>



You will observe that in 1908 most of the occupations were classed as hazardous, whereas at the present time not a single occupation or group of employments is so classified.

You will further note that the important occupations of blower and roller are now free from all extra premiums, being accepted at regular rates.

Many of the other occupations are accepted at the present time at special rates, and only a few still require medium rates.

I should have said that we have four premium charges, respectively, the regular, special, medium, and hazardous rates. Occupations above the hazardous rate are entirely declined.

The foregoing statement is really an extraordinary contribution to safety literature, emphasizing clearly and without the shadow of a doubt that, in the opinion of one of the most conservative of life insurance companies, your work has produced results sufficiently measurable in their effects on health and longevity to justify the practical elimination of all the former most burdensome extra premium charges. Where so much has been brought about during the few years that you have been actively at work there is every reason for believing that further improvement will be found possible in course of time. You are indeed to be congratulated on the splendid result of your work.

Very truly yours,

F. L. HOFFMAN,

*Third Vice President and Statistician.*

Mr. GARY (continuing). Here is a report by five stockholders appointed as the result of a resolution passed at the stockholders' meeting in 1912, on motion of a gentleman from Boston who was the owner of about ten shares of stock, and who was what we call an uplift man.

Senator WALSH. A reformer?

Mr. GARY. Yes, a reformer, Mr. Cabot. He and Mr. Fitch were interested in a certain magazine, and he offered this resolution demanding an investigation of our treatment of employees, as to the seven-day week, etc., etc., and although I had proxies for nearly all the stock and could have voted down the resolution, I thought it was only fair to give him a chance, and I passed his resolution for him and appointed this committee, made up of Mr. Stuyvesant Fish, president of the Illinois Central Railroad; Mr. Thomas DeWitt Cuyler, of Philadelphia; Mr. Darius Miller, of Chicago; Mr. Charles A. Painter, of Pittsburgh, a former steel man, who sold out in 1901; and Mr. Charles L. Taylor, who had been up to that time in charge of the Carnegie pension work and various other work of that kind. That committee made a report April 15, 1912, and I am glad to say that Mr. Cabot, having spent two years or more in making investigations and going around with the committee from time to time and from plant to plant, voted in favor of the adoption of the resolution. I will offer that in evidence because it shows a good deal about the situation in regard to hours, days, etc.

(The report referred to is printed at the conclusion of Mr. Gary's statement.)

Mr. GARY (continuing). In transmitting that report of May 28, 1912, to the stockholders I made certain observations in regard to the whole subject matter and have a copy of that which I would like to offer for the record.

ACTION OF UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION UPON RECOMMENDATIONS OF STOCKHOLDERS' COMMITTEE.

MAY 28, 1912.

TO THE STOCKHOLDERS OF UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION:

Inclosed is a copy of the report of the committee of stockholders appointed at the annual meeting on April 17, 1911, to investigate conditions of labor in our mills. To this subject the officers of the United States Steel Corporation and

its subsidiary companies had already given earnest consideration. For 10 years we had been improving the conditions of our workmen as fast as practicable. Nevertheless, we did not resent the appointment of a committee of stockholders to investigate these matters. As holder of the proxies for a majority of the stockholders, I voted in favor of the resolution and it was adopted. The committee was made up of five prominent stockholders, and every opportunity for a thorough investigation was afforded them. No amount of trouble was spared, and the expense of the investigation and report to all the stockholders is large. The report of the committee was presented at the annual meeting on April 15, 1912, and a copy is being sent to every stockholder. We believe the report reflects great credit upon the committee, to whom the stockholders are indebted for the full performance of an arduous duty.

The report covers four subjects enumerated as follows by the committee:

- (a) The seven-day week and long turn.
- (b) The twelve-hour day.
- (c) The speeding of the workmen.
- (d) The repression of the men.

Briefly stated, the findings of the committee upon these four subjects are as follows:

1. With respect to the seven-day week and long turn, the committee says: "The records of to-day indicate that with the exception of two or three plants, the seven-day week has been relegated to the past." The committee adds that this should "be absolutely enforced at all times, in all mines, mills, shops, railways, docks and works of the Steel Corporation."

The committee believes "that it is feasible and practicable to eliminate the long turn formerly followed in the changing of shifts in continuous-process work, and that it should be done. Further, that conscientious effort should be made by all to reduce to a positive minimum any undue length in work hours that emergencies and unforeseen conditions may sometimes demand."

The finance committee recommended the elimination of seven-day labor as long ago as April 23, 1907, and the stockholders' committee reports that this recommendation is being observed; but to leave no room for doubt, the finance committee has now adopted the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That in accordance with the spirit of the resolution adopted by this committee on April 23, 1907, seven-day labor should be eliminated in all mines, mills, shops, railways, docks and works of the Steel Corporation, except under special circumstances and then only upon the consent of this committee."

"*Resolved*, That the so-called long turn, formerly followed in the change of shifts in continuous process work, should be eliminated or reduced in all cases where it now continues among employees of the subsidiary companies, except under special circumstances and then only upon the consent of this committee."

"*Resolved*, That conscientious efforts should be made by all to reduce to a minimum any unusual length in work hours that emergencies and unforeseen conditions may sometimes demand."

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the presidents of all the subsidiary companies with the recommendation that all operating officials be governed accordingly."

2. With respect to the 12-hour day, the stockholders' committee says: "That steps should be taken now that shall have for their purpose and end a reasonable and just arrangement to all concerned of the problems involved in this question—that of reducing the long hours of labor—we would respectfully recommend to the intelligent and thoughtful consideration of the proper officers of the corporation."

In response to this recommendation, the finance committee has passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the chairman, Mr. Roberts, and the president of the corporation be appointed a committee to consider what, if any, arrangement with a view to reducing the 12-hour day, in so far as it now exists among the employees of the subsidiary companies, is reasonable, just, and practicable."

3. With respect to the alleged "speeding of the workmen," the stockholders' committee says: "Our observation of labor conditions in the mills of the Steel Corporation does not lead us to believe that there is either desire or tendency on the part of the foremen and superintendents to pursue these policies to a point that would mean harm or injury to the men under their charge."

4. With respect to the so-called "repression of the men," the stockholders' committee finds "that the Steel Corporation, in view of the practices often pur-

sued by labor organizations in steel mills in past years, is justified in the position it has taken." That position is an adherence to the principle of the open shop which permits any workman to labor whether he is a member of a union or not.

The report of the stockholders' committee contains a summary of certain plans which the corporation has put in force for the benefit of its workmen, namely, accident prevention, accident relief, pension, sanitation and welfare, and employees' stock subscription. It is proper that the stockholders should know what is being spent annually for thus bettering the conditions of the workmen. This aggregate annual expenditure, which would otherwise be available for dividends, is as follows:

Relief for men injured and the families of men killed, which is paid in all cases regardless of legal liability, costs each year, approximately-----	\$2, 000, 000
Accident prevention, in which we have probably the most effective system in the United States, costs each year, approximately-----	750, 000
Sanitation and welfare work of all sorts, which we are now developing, costs already each year, approximately-----	1, 250, 000
The pension fund, which provides support for superannuated employees, requires each year:	
For pension payments, approximately-----	200, 000
For the creation of a permanent fund to be completed in 13 years-----	500, 000
The employees' stock-subscription plan costs each year approximately-----	750, 000
Total annual expenditures for improving the conditions of workmen, approximately-----	5, 450, 000

Wages have not been reduced, but, on the contrary, have been increased nearly 25 per cent since the corporation was organized; and the workmen have not been required to contribute in any way to the expenditures for their benefit.

While we believe all our stockholders will approve these expenditures, we have not felt that the amount should be increased more rapidly, or that conditions which have existed ever since the industry was established could practicably be improved with greater rapidity than we have been endeavoring to improve them.

In conclusion, the stockholders' committee recommends that hereafter and at stated periods correct and reliable first-hand information as to these matters and the advancement and betterments being effected be furnished to all stockholders. This recommendation is under consideration by the finance committee, which has directed a plan to be prepared and reported to it.

In evidence of the long-continued and earnest consideration given to improving the conditions among workmen of the United States Steel Corporation, there are inclosed copies of a number of statements with respect to these matters made for the corporation by the chairman at intervals ever since 1904. They show the principles which the officers and directors of the corporation have tried to inculcate and to follow.

ELBERT H. GARY, *Chairman.*

Senator STERLING. Has there been any attention paid by the corporation to school facilities for the education of the children of the workmen?

Mr. GARY. A great deal. We have tried to establish schools in every locality where we are interested, so that the children of the families of the workmen could have full opportunity of securing education. We have expended millions for that purpose.

Senator WALSH. That is, your company has built the school buildings and turned them over to the public authorities?

Mr. GARY. Yes. In places we have built the schools and paid the entire expense, and in other places we have contributed to the public fund largely; but we have generally paid for them. We have paid out a great deal in this way.

I have here a statement showing the facilities constructed or installed for uses of employees for the purposes named below :

Number of dwellings and boarding houses constructed and leased to employees at low rental rates.....	25, 965
Churches.....	23
Schools.....	43
Clubs.....	17
Restaurants and lunch rooms.....	53
Rest and waiting rooms.....	171
Playgrounds.....	131
Swimming pools.....	11
Athletic fields.....	88
Tennis courts.....	88
Band stands.....	16
Practical housekeeping centers.....	16
Piped systems for drinking water.....	355
Sanitary drinking fountains.....	2, 835
Wells and springs protected against pollution.....	597
Comfort stations (complete units), either bath or dry houses, closets, wash or locker rooms, in separate buildings or within enclosures in the buildings.....	1, 390
Water closet bowls.....	6, 837
Urinals.....	2, 329
Washing faucets or basins.....	16, 479
Showers.....	2, 446
Clothes lockers.....	110, 759
Base hospitals.....	25
Emergency stations.....	279
Training stations (first aid and rescue).....	64
Company surgeons, physicians, and internes.....	156
Outside surgeons serving on salary.....	106
Nurses (including nurses in training).....	154
Orderlies and other attendants.....	98
Visiting nurses.....	62
Teachers and instructors.....	209
Sanitary inspectors.....	25
Safety inspectors (spending entire time on work).....	106
Employees who have served on safety committees.....	22, 000
Employees now serving on safety committees.....	5, 426
Employees who have been trained in first aid and rescue work.....	16, 637
Employees now training.....	676

Senator STERLING. Speaking of hospital service, is that rendered at a charge to the employees?

Mr. GARY. No, sir; that is free service.

Senator PHIPPS. You have established a plan by which workmen may acquire stock in the corporation. I think that might be amplified a little. I doubt if the members of the committee understand that plan.

Mr. GARY. With the beginning of each year we purchase in the open market either preferred or common stock, as the case may be. For several years we purchased only preferred; common stock was not so stable then; but after it was considered to be a stable stock and our employes were asking the privilege of subscribing for common stock, we offered that, and that has been offered for two or three years at least. This stock is offered to the employees at a certain discount, slightly under the cost to us, generally about two points, sometimes three, and the employee has the privilege of paying for that in instalments out of his salary within a certain number of years. We would give him any time he wanted, I might say, in practice, that is if he had five years to pay for it and it was

not all paid at the end of that time, we would extend the time if he requested it. Very seldom, if ever, I think perhaps in a few cases, we have been asked to do that. If, in the meantime, the employee desires to abandon that stock, that is, discontinue making payments on that stock, he is at liberty to turn it in and receive the cash.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you say how much stock of the company was owned by its employees?

Mr. GARY. I did say that at the present time I think there are about 70,000 or 75,000 of our employees. I will just give you the present year. The subscription was larger than ever before. Up to September 1, 1919, 61,324 employees subscribed for 158,061 shares. That was offered to them this year, as I remember, at 92. Since that time the stock has of course been a great deal higher.

Senator PHIPPS. But the bonus paid is what we want to get at.

Mr. GARY. And at the end of each year while they are continuing the payments they receive a drawback or a rebate of \$5 per share, so that at the end of five years they would receive the stock at the original cost price with 25 points discount, one-quarter of the purchase price discount, receiving the dividends in the meantime.

Senator PHIPPS. That is fair. In addition to that have you some plan or system of bonuses prevailing among the various plants which recognize superior services?

Mr. GARY. It was at the beginning perhaps called a bonus plan; I do not know but it was in the original prospectus. We do not call it a bonus, I might say, for the reason that it is more or less distasteful to an employee, and also for the reason I think it ought to be distasteful; that is, I do not consider it a bonus, I consider it special compensation, and it is so termed in our reports as you will see.

All of this I speak of, which has been done, and the amount we have expended for the benefit of our employees is extraordinary as compared with anything that has ever been done before, so far as I know, anywhere or during any period. But I want to say, what, I have often said in our own private circles, I do not think we have been liberal; I think we have been only fair.

I know it has been claimed by some people in the manufacturing business that we have been overliberal in the salaries and in the wages, the wage rates we have paid, and in the efforts we have made, at large expense, to improve the conditions of our workmen and their families. In times of stress, when the weather is cold and the mills are shut down and when, as in 1913, large numbers of our men were out of employment, and as you know all over this country there were thousands and thousands of unemployed, instructions were sent out to our presidents to see that there was no suffering among the families and that they were taken care of. In all we have done, as much as it amounts to in dollars and cents, I do not think we have expended one dollar more than we ought to have done, in my opinion.

Senator PHIPPS. That is in fairness to the men and in fairness to the stockholders?

Mr. GARY. In fairness to the men, in justice to the men. But I should like to add that while I have nothing whatever to say against the desire or inclination of a labor union or anyone else to bring about by their unions an influence to secure better conditions for the

men, the laborers, the workmen, I do not think they are any more interested, in fact I do not think they are one-tenth as much interested, in our workmen as we are ourselves. I think the action of our finance committee, expressed by resolutions and in various ways, has demonstrated all these years that we appreciate the loyalty of our men and the efficiency of their service, and we have only tried to be fair and reasonable.

There has never been an application made by our presidents or any of them for an appropriation to improve the living and working conditions, or the safety and health of our men, that was not promptly approved and granted. And Mr. Close, who is at the head of the welfare department, is devoting his whole time with his organization in ascertaining those conditions.

Now, then, it is only acknowledging the truth when I admit, I think, as has been mentioned by some of the preceding witnesses, that the employers are benefited by this. Of course, the employer is benefited by the good treatment of labor; the service is more loyal, more efficient, more continuous. Through the war if our employees had not been loyal and efficient the military necessities of our country and its associates in the war, for steel, would not have been supplied, in my judgment; and I think the credit for that belongs to the United States Steel Corporation and to our competitors in business.

The whole steel industry, I think, has been placed upon a higher basis in regard to labor—I mean the steel industry, represented by the American Iron & Steel Institute, of which I have the honor to be president, and have had ever since it was organized—I think has placed and maintained the conditions relating to employment on a higher basis than ever before realized in any country or at any period. I do not boast of that, but I state it as what I believe to be a positive fact, and I may say I think we have had some influence on other lines. And you gentlemen come in contact with manufacturers who are employing large numbers of men, and anyone anywhere will express to you an opinion on that subject, and what it will be I can only conjecture.

Senator PHIPPS. Judge Gary, there is one other minor point that should be cleared up. We have been given to understand that the company—that objection has been raised to so-called physical examination of employees before they are given employment. Does that grow out of your system of insuring men against accident or otherwise?

Mr. GARY. We have got some records here in regard to that. I am not aware of the objections coming from our men. It is essential to the workmen themselves and to their fellows in the mills. An applicant for service or for a position may be infected with a disease that is curable. If that is so and it is ascertained, he may be cured. Should he be infected with an incurable disease, such as epilepsy for instance, or it may be a contagious disease—

Senator PHIPPS. And that would be a great danger to the other employees?

Mr. GARY. Yes; and it would not be fair to the other employees.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you understand that that physical examination is now one of the complaints or demands of the—

Mr. GARY. One of the 12 demands?

Senator PHIPPS. One of these 12 demands.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it not a fact that a very few years ago physical examinations were not only not objected to but as a matter of fact recommended by the labor organizations as a proper thing?

Mr. GARY. I think that is true.

Senator PHIPPS. As late as two years ago, perhaps.

Mr. GARY. It was not long ago. It would be a very great mistake, from the standpoint of the public interest, to abolish that system.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Judge Gary, the claim has been made that by reason of its size the Steel Corporation absolutely dominates the steel industry of the United States; that its competitors are compelled to follow its lead; they may not be directly told to in so many words, but they are given to understand that if they do not they will be looked upon as objectionable; while not told exactly that they will be put out of business, the net result would be probably to that effect.

Mr. GARY. Well, the contrary of that has been demonstrated by the testimony of these men in the courts, and by the figures which show that instead of following us, they have eclipsed us in percentages, that is they have increased their percentages, many of them, much more rapidly than we, and new companies have been started, such as the Youngstown Sheet & Tube, a big, successful company, started some time after the Steel Corporation was formed. The Inland Steel is another. And these other companies, like Jones & Loughlin and the Republic Iron & Steel Co. and many others, have increased their percentages in the total trade very much more than we have. The statement is not true, that is all; the facts are to the contrary.

Senator PHIPPS. On the question of earnings, attention has been called to the unusual earnings or very large earnings of the Steel Corporation particularly during the years 1917 and 1918, that they are very large; was that abnormal owing to the war conditions and the increased production?

Mr. GARY. Yes, it was larger than it ever had been before. Even after the payment of the large income tax on what is called excess profits it was some larger.

Senator PHIPPS. How does that compare with other years?

Mr. GARY (interrupting). Just let me finish that, if you please. Excuse me, Senator. Our properties are worth, actually worth at least two billions and a quarter. That is susceptible of demonstration; there is no question about it. The properties could not be replaced for any less sum, and on that basis the amount of net profits that we are realizing is very moderate; on the basis of our capital stock it seems perhaps somewhat large, but our properties now are worth very much more than the capital stock and bonds.

Senator McKELLAR. That is just the point I want to get at. What is the amount of your capital stock?

Mr. GARY. The preferred is about \$350,000,000, and the common is about \$505,000,000.

Senator McKELLAR. Five hundred and—

Mr. GARY. \$505,000,000, and the bonds are in the neighborhood of six hundred or six hundred and fifty millions.

Senator PHIPPS. As I understand it there were years since the corporation was organized in 1901 when you did not earn any dividends on your common stock and there was one period, I believe, when you did not even earn the dividends on the preferred stock.

Mr. GARY. That is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. What were your profits last year?

Mr. GARY. I beg your pardon?

The CHAIRMAN. What were your net profits last year?

Mr. GARY. Have you the report here?

Senator PHIPPS. It has been stated that it was the policy of the plants belonging to the Steel Corporation to give foreigners—men of foreign birth and unnaturalized residents preference in employment as against American citizens.

Mr. GARY. Of course, that is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope that some time you will explain how it is you happen to have so many foreigners employed.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; and whether or not the company takes any steps to obtain foreigners.

Mr. GARY. I want to answer that right here. During the war, as you know, we needed as many men as we could get. We were expending at the rate of a million dollars or more a month to extend our plants to increase our capacity in order to take care of the military necessities. I said a million dollars a month; I meant from ten to twelve million dollars a month.

The CHAIRMAN. This witness who was here a few moments ago said that the proportion of foreigners now was the same as before the war.

Mr. GARY. I think that is a mistake; I do not think that the proportion was as great, that is all. Of course we have employed a great many foreigners. And please do not forget what I said this morning, that I do not admit the large majority or the majority of the foreigners are what might be termed radicals; quite the contrary; I think that the radicals are in a minority; I think there is danger of doing injustice to the thousands upon thousands of foreigners who are loyal and faithful and efficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Some witness stated here—I do not remember who he was—that these companies were in the habit of bringing in large numbers of foreigners; I think he said the protected industries in days gone by.

Mr. GARY. I am inclined to think, although I will have to state largely on information and impression, there was a time away back when the manufacturers of this country were seeking—were trying to influence the increased immigration of foreigners to supply the manufacturers' necessities. As you will remember, many years ago—some of you lawyers can tell me when—a law was passed prohibiting that and of course that stopped it. Now I do not think it will be claimed that since that law was passed it has been violated in the spirit or the letter. But is it to be wondered that foreigners from Europe, receiving one-half or one-third or one-quarter, as the case may be, of the compensation they could secure in this country, should come here in large numbers? Of course they have been coming to this country and coming rapidly. Now, why have the labor unions objected to their coming? Simply to decrease the number of employees and to increase the demand for laborers so as to protect, we may say, a few here.

Now, in making that statement I may be talking against Americans and foreigners both. And I raise no question in regard to it; human nature is about the same and everyone is looking to his own



interests—I make no complaint in regard to that. But so far as the general public is concerned, what we want now particularly is production, increased production. There is no cure in my judgment for this increased cost of living except increased production. We want men, we want every manufactory running full, we want if necessary increased hours even up to the point of the willingness on the part of the employee and the health of the employee. But there is no use talking about increased wages, decreased production, and then lowering of the cost of living. They do not go together.

Senator PHIPPS. Judge Gary, what influence do you think the open-shop method of operation as against the closed shop would have on production and the pay that the workmen would receive?

Mr. GARY. The closed shop of course means less production; it means less hours; it means higher wages. You understand I am in favor of high wages, liberal wages. but there is a point where you must stop as a matter of course, because if the workman increases his wages then his employer increases the selling price of his product. He is working against himself all the time; they are pulling against one another. My idea is to establish a fair basis. I think prices are too high all around; but, as I advocated in two steel meetings, I believe in lowering the prices of selling commodities first and then working from that back down and decreasing the labor rates last and proportionately. The steel people started that, as you know; they made two decreases in their selling prices, one early in December, shortly after the armistice, of about \$5 a ton, and another a little later, about, as I remember, the 1st of February—I may be slightly mistaken as to the date—of \$5 more a ton, and then this industrial board which Secretary Redfield created interfered with it—it is not necessary to go over that—and other decreases were not made and so that whole scheme failed. It should have been continued. It was a wise thing.

Senator MCKELLAR. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is about time to adjourn, and I move that we adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, if that will suit the witness.

Mr. GARY. Anything suits me.

(Thereupon the motion prevailed and the hearing was adjourned, at 5.30 o'clock p. m., until the following day, October 2, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)



# INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate, met pursuant to adjournment of yesterday, in room 235, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Page, McLean, Sterling, Phipps, Smith of Georgia, Jones of New Mexico, McKellar, Wolcott and Walsh of Massachusetts.

Also present: E. H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors, chairman of the finance committee, and chief executive officer of the United States Steel Corporation.

R. V. Lindabury, general counsel, United States Steel Corporation.  
John Reis, vice president, United States Steel Corporation.

W. J. Filbert, comptroller, United States Steel Corporation.

James B. Bonner, manager of sales, United States Steel Corporation.

C. L. Close, manager bureau of safety, sanitation and welfare, United States Steel Corporation.

Davis A. Reed, counsel, United States Steel Corporation.

## STATEMENT OF MR. ELBERT H. GARY—Resumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Judge Gary, I asked you a question last night that was not answered, and I think perhaps you might answer it now. It was in regard to the profits of the steel company last year. Suppose you give them to us from 1914 down to the present time, if you can.

Mr. GARY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I will get those figures together, and while that is being done I would like to call attention to a matter here. There is an error, perhaps my own, on page 481 of the record, where I was asked by yourself about how many there are receiving 42 cents per hour, and the record reads that a large majority of them were receiving that rate. That should be a "minority" instead of a "majority" who are receiving the 42-cent rate in the manufacturing companies—that is, where the strikes are pending, the number is 46,638, or 24.4 per cent. Of those above 42 cents there are 154,327, or 75.6 per cent.

And one other thing, if the Senator will indulge me. In the report made by George Rothwell Brown from Youngstown, Ohio, and published in the Washington Post this morning, he states:

A week's investigation in the steel district has convinced me that an overwhelming majority of the men engaged in it do not want this strike. I get this viewpoint, not from the steel operators, but from the business men of widely scattered communities, from those who are in daily, intimate, and sympathetic contact with the working men and from the working men themselves. I have

talked with hundreds of them face to face. The strike is artificial from top to bottom. It lacks the moral support of the men who are actually on strike, is deplored by those skilled working men who have been thrown out of employment by the strike of the unskilled laborers, and will fall of its own weight if encouragement does not come from high quarters.

In that connection I wish to emphasize one point. There are three classes of workmen as applied to the present strike and strike conditions: first, the Americans; secondly, a large number of foreigners, foreign born, some naturalized and some not naturalized; and thirdly, a minority of foreigners who are the ones, as I view it, engaged in the actual strike, and members of the labor union.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion do you figure is that minority?

Mr. GARY. That minority? I do not think it is over 15 per cent at the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you quoted George Rothwell Brown of the Washington Post?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is he, do you know?

Mr. GARY. I do not know. I only know he states the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. You only know that he states the truth?

Mr. GARY. He states the truth, I am very sure.

The CHAIRMAN. I noticed another article from him in the paper this morning to the effect that it would be a very unfortunate thing for this committee to visit and go over the ground where the strike is taking place. Do you agree with that, Judge Gary?

Mr. GARY. Well, if the investigation could be made simply for the benefit of this committee, and accurately and carefully made, that ought to be done. There is danger of there being a misunderstanding on the part of some of the workmen in regard to the object of the visit, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you think that because there may be danger of some misunderstanding on the part of some of the workmen that this committee ought not to try to get all the facts?

Mr. GARY. I think you should get all the facts, but it seems to me it might be more desirable if you had your own representative or representatives go down there, take their own time, and quietly go over the different plants of all the Steel Corporation, taking, if necessary, a week or two weeks and making a thorough, full, and complete investigation, which I am afraid your committee could not do in a short time. And besides, it would avoid that other question. I am inclined to think there is something in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that the committee ought not to go?

Mr. GARY. I won't say that. I think that is for the committee to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. You have quoted George Rothwell Brown and approved his doctrine as enunciated, and I wondered if you approved of that statement of his.

Mr. GARY. I do not wish to approve or disapprove that, if you please.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not very important.

Mr. GARY. I do not know whether the chairman noticed this article in regard to the strikers breaking up a meeting in Steubenville, Ohio:

Five hundred steel strikers marched on Mingo Junction, 3 miles south of here, to-night, invaded a hall, and prevented a meeting of Mingo Junction steel

workers of the Carnegie Co. plant there, who had decided to take a vote on the question of returning to work. The marchers reached the hall just about the time it was to be called to order by James Brettell, a member of the Mingo Junction Civic League, under whose auspices the meeting was to have been held.

That is typical, characteristic, and represents conditions in regard to some of the matters mentioned by the chairman of this committee on yesterday in his inquiries.

Senator PHIPPS. That you would class as intimidation, would you?

Mr. GARY. Certainly.

Senator PHIPPS. Reference has been made frequently to other forms of intimidation, such as threatening men who desired to continue working. Have you any evidence of such threats?

Mr. GARY. Well, we have considerable. I have here a number of letters, with the envelopes, original letters—with the interpretation of the letters, written by some one, generally more or less anonymous, but some of them signed.

Senator PHIPPS. Will you read one or two samples of those?

Mr. GARY. If you will permit I would be glad not to give the names publicly. Of course, I am willing that the Senators on the committee should have the names, but I do not wish to place anyone in jeopardy. Here is a sample:

SWISSVALE, PA.,  
September 24, 1919.

DEAR MADAM: How are you with your children after your husband scabbing at Carrie furnaces. You are sending him notice he had better come home because he won't lose more than five days. You will see him in box and will not get any benefits from no kind "Enshorance"——

Whatever that means——

if he get killed in strike.

Yours, very truly.

Then the name is signed and on the bottom here, represented in a crude picture, is the husband in a coffin.

I have quite a good many of these, which, as I say, are original letters, original envelopes (and interpretations), which have been sent to different families, and turned in, or at least mailed to the company.

Of course, as a rule they do not give information of those facts, they are afraid to do so. It is only where they are very well acquainted—I mean they do not give up the letters, but do inform us. We have information from many, many families, where they have been threatened with the killing of the husband and father, the blowing up of the house, the kidnapping of the children, and so forth.

I would be very glad to submit these letters to the senatorial committee.

Mr. REED. May we ask the committee that if these letters, or any of them, are printed in the record, the names be omitted.

Mr. RUBIN. How about the signers of the letters?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will take that matter up and determine it. It will not determine it now.

Senator PHIPPS. The committee will be given an opportunity to look over that evidence?

Mr. GARY. That is all I have to suggest at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Then we will go back to my question.

Mr. GARY. Your question of yesterday was confined to 1918, as I remember it.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I want the profits from 1914.

Mr. GARY. In 1914, after deducting the Federal taxes, \$58,267,925.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the net profit?

Mr. GARY. Yes; 1915, \$107,832,016; 1916, \$303,449,476; 1917, \$253,608,200; and 1918, \$167,562,280.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us the dividends for those years?

Mr. GARY. They were 7 per cent on the preferred and 5 per cent on the common, and there was 12 per cent extra on the common for something over a year, I think. In 1914 the dividend on the common stock was only 3 per cent instead of 5 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in 1914?

Mr. GARY. Yes, in 1914. In 1915 only 1½ per cent for the year; 1916, 8½ per cent. I will have to correct my figures on that, Mr. Chairman: 1914, 3 per cent on the common stock; 1915, 1½ per cent on the common stock; 1916, 8½ per cent on the common stock; 1917, 5 per cent and 13 per cent extra, including 1 per cent for Red Cross purposes; 1918, it was 14 per cent. On the preferred it was 7 per cent all the time; that has always been 7 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us the amount you passed to surplus in those years?

Mr. GARY. I can not do that in a second, but of course, I will give you those figures.

The CHAIRMAN. You will do that later?

Mr. GARY. Yes. They are all carefully included in our annual reports.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that show in any way the amount written off for depreciation?

Mr. GARY. Not this, no, but—

The CHAIRMAN. You will furnish those figures?

Mr. GARY. I will, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Gary, do you desire to go ahead with any statement?

Mr. GARY. Just in answer to a question propounded yesterday, with reference to men working the long turns at the shift from night to day turns. At the manufacturing plants, out of a total of 191,000 employees 82 worked a continuous 24 hours once in each month.

Mr. REED. That is not 82,000 men.

Senator McKELLAR. The gentleman who testified yesterday that there were four or five hundred is mistaken, then?

Mr. GARY. He is mistaken; I have it exactly—344 men work a continuous 18 hours twice each month. These are all in the blast furnace department. No other employees work a continuous 24 or 18 hours, except in emergency times like the war or something of that sort. The chairman of the committee will bear in mind that we have been reducing these hours from year to year and from time to time, going back many years, as rapidly as we could, by consultations, by good management, and particularly by the introduction of improvements in machinery, in devices which increased work and decreased manual labor. The hard work in our works we think is not the rule; on the contrary it is the rare exception.

I would like to add in that connection that, except for the labor-saving devices, the improvements in machinery, which have been the

result of constant study and experiments in the hands of a large corps of engineers, under the general direction of one of our vice presidents, Mr. Reis—except for the improvements which have been more or less put into practice throughout the country, and perhaps other countries, I doubt if there could have been sufficient production to supply the necessities of the general public.

Now, of course, we are expending as you know large sums of money all the time for the purpose of relieving men of hard work by the introduction of machinery and the saving of hours, and in the direction of being able to secure necessary production without extending the hours of labor, with the purpose of reducing the hours and relieving the men of hard work.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, by whom are the labor policies of your company determined?

Mr. GARY. The labor policies?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARY. May I ask just what you mean by that?

The CHAIRMAN. How you deal with labor, hours of service, sanitary conditions, and things of that kind; who determines what you will do?

Mr. GARY. The determination, if any question is raised or if any new policy is proposed, is by the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator McKELLAR. That is this committee of 15 that you spoke of?

Mr. GARY. No; the committee of seven.

The CHAIRMAN. Of which you are chairman?

Mr. GARY. Of which I am chairman. Of course they come through the foreman who is in consultation with the men, the superintendent, the manager, the vice presidents, and presidents of the subsidiary companies, and then up to the president of the Steel Corporation, and from him to me, and then to the finance committee. As I intended to say yesterday, so far as I know there has never been a recommendation or a suggestion that we have had in regard to improving the conditions of our men in any respect that was not approved and carried into practical effect by the Steel Corporation, so far as the expenditure of money was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Take the question of employing foreigners in your mills, such a question as that. Who would determine that?

Mr. GARY. If any question was raised, the finance committee would determine it; but, of course, it is in the hands and in the immediate control and direction of the foremen, in consultation with the superintendents of the work.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this. You have had practically no unionism in your mills since 1901 and 1909, at the time of the strikes?

Mr. GARY. That is not quite true. As I stated yesterday, it was continued for some time in some of the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARY. We left the unions and contracted with them where they existed at the time of the organization, made contracts with them for a number of years, until finally it was all eliminated in the way and at the time stated by me on yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. About what time was that?

Mr. GARY. I think the last was in 1912.

The CHAIRMAN. 1912?

Mr. GARY. I think so; the tin plate trouble at Bridgeport, 1909, I am told.

The CHAIRMAN. 1909?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I understood.

Mr. GARY. Yes; 1909.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the charge has been made here that your company had the policy of employing foreigners of different nationalities and putting them around in the different places so as to prevent any cohesive action among the men.

Mr. GARY. There is absolutely no foundation for that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Has not the question of employing these large numbers of what you call foreigners, some of them with feelings against the institutions of this country, been a subject of discussion by your board?

Mr. GARY. It has not.

The CHAIRMAN. You never thought about it?

Mr. GARY. The question has never been raised.

The CHAIRMAN. You think now that this foreign element is precipitating this strike, do you not?

Mr. GARY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. That 15 per cent?

Mr. GARY. I do. But I think it should be remembered that the question of the necessary number of employees can not be ignored. As I stated yesterday, if we had not had the services of foreigners during the war we could not have continued; we could not have uninterruptedly continued our operations. I ought to say there, though, if we had known there was a substantial number of the kind of foreigners who, I think, are now making the real trouble here, who are disturbing the peace, who are resorting to violence, and who I believe are under the leadership of outsiders, we would not have employed them.

Senator PHIPPS. Judge Gary, take normal periods existing before the war, would it have been possible to supply your demand for ordinary labor with American workmen?

Mr. GARY. It would not.

Senator PHIPPS. It was necessary for you to take the employees as they applied for jobs in order to fill up your complement of forces?

Mr. GARY. It was, and always has been; and yet of course at no time would we employ a man whom we believed was disloyal in sentiment to this country, even if we had to correspondingly reduce our production and close down our manufactories.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, as to skilled labor, is it the fact that the positions requiring skilled labor are as a general rule filled by American men, American boys who have had some school education, and who have intelligence and training?

Mr. GARY. I think that would be an overstatement, because there are large numbers of foreigners who have become Americanized, really the larger number, and who have been successful and have been promoted and are occupying places where skilled work is required—multitudes of them.

Senator MCKELLAR. Prior to the war, did your company have any contractual relations, either express or implied, with steamship com-



panies or any other companies by which foreign labor was secured for your companies?

Mr. GARY. We did not. That is, immediately prior or along about that time. If there were any such it was long ago and before the law regarding the importation of men was passed. And I do not say that there were then. I do not know of any, but I would not dispute it as to that period.

The CHAIRMAN. During this period and up to the present, where you have had no unionism in your mills, how did the men present any grievances? Who is there to speak for the men, and regardless as to the merits of unionism or nonunionism how can individual men without unions present their grievances? And in that connection let me call your attention to volume 3 of the report made in 1912 by the Department of Labor, to which I referred yesterday. Speaking on this question, page 15, they say:

"The workmen, furthermore"—these are the workmen in the steel mills—"have no effective means of determining the conditions under which they work, or even calling attention to the features which they consider unjust. Apart from the fact that a very large number of the workmen can not make themselves understood, either by their superior officers or by many of their fellow workmen, they are almost entirely without organization, through which alone demands and protests can be made effective."

How can the unorganized workmen present their grievances?

Mr. GARY. Individually or through committees appointed by themselves, which is frequently done, which so far as I know is always done if there is any grievance to present.

They have their different methods. The foreman is in close contact with the men, they are in close contact with him; they do not hesitate to present their views, and we hear them as coming through committees. A very striking instance occurred some months ago, not to be specific, which I will tell you about if you care to hear it. It illustrates the situation. A man occupying an important position I think, at a critical time suddenly discontinued his work: he was called to account by the foreman, and then the superintendent was called in, and the wrong done having been very grievous the man was asked by the superintendent why he did that under those circumstances. He replied he was obeying the orders of outsiders, and he told who they were—the association. And he was asked if he believed he had a right under the circumstances to disobey the orders of his superior officer and listen to an outsider. He said whether he did or not he felt that he was obliged to do it. Whereupon he was discharged.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that an act of sabotage?

Mr. GARY. Well, you can characterize it, Senator. Soon after a committee of a number of gentlemen engaged in that department appealed to the manager and he consulted the president. They stated they thought this man should be taken back. Now, how many of those men were union men I do not know and did not inquire. Of course we had some reason to think that some of them—if not all of them—were members of the union, but I do not make the assertion because I have no proof of it. But the president received the impression that perhaps the man was somewhat repentant. He and the manager disagreed. Under the circumstances they decided to present the

case to the Steel Corporation. I think members of this committee to which I have referred asked to have that done. Anyhow, they did come to our offices; and I said to the president, "I advise you to go back, call in the general manager, so that he shall have fair opportunity to be heard, and summon this man and members of the committee. If you find the man is really repentant, that he was obeying the orders of outsiders, but he is willing to come back and to observe the orders of his superior officers, I would take him back anyhow. Of course if he is going to remain in the frame of mind he entertained when he refused to work, that is a different thing; after all we do not want to injure the man if he has really changed his opinion." And I said, "Don't bring up the question of unionism at all; that makes no difference. Don't ask that question, don't pay any attention to that, don't ask whether he belongs to a union." That was carried into effect. Now, there were a number of men who appeared as that committee, I can not tell you how many, but quite a large number that had been selected by the men.

Now, you ask if a man does not understand English how is he going to present his grievances, if he has any, even to a committee to be selected. Perhaps the answer might be that it would be just as difficult to present any claim or grievance to the members of a labor union or to a self-appointed advocate or leader. It is done through interpreters. There is always some one who can speak for and with these men, whether it is a labor union leader trying to represent them or whether it is the foreman acting for them. Many of these men do have a smattering of English; they get along in employment, but many of them can not speak good English—not a majority of them but a good many, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. You are familiar with the policies enunciated by the National War Labor Board, are you not, Judge?

Mr. GARY. Well, to some extent. I am not particularly acquainted with those conditions or facts.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice in the "Principles and policies to govern relations between workers and employers in war industries for the duration of the war," this proposition is laid down:

Right to organize. The right of workers to organize in trade-unions and to bargain collectively through chosen representatives is recognized and affirmed. This right shall not be denied, abridged, or interfered with by the employers in any manner whatsoever.

Did you subscribe to any such doctrine as that for war times?

Mr. GARY. It depends upon what you mean by collective bargaining. If you mean the collective bargaining that the labor unions are now claiming to insist upon, we did not. If you mean the right of men through committees to present their questions, or any question, yes, in principle. We had nothing to do with the War Labor Board.

The CHAIRMAN. You had nobody from your plant connected with it at all?

Mr. GARY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the right to organize in trade-unions—you do not endorse that policy, do you?

Mr. GARY. No—well, the right to organize—I do endorse that. I do not combat or contest that. I think laboring people have a

perfect right to join a union, and I think anybody has a right to form a union.

Senator JONES. Judge Gary, I understood Mr. Fitzpatrick to state here the other day that they were not seeking to organize all of the men of the Steel Corporation into the union and have it what is known as a "union shop;" that that was not the issue at all, and I understand now that you substantially put yourself on the same plane, you do not object to these men belonging to labor unions, if I understand you correctly.

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Senator JONES. And the other parties are not insisting that all of your employees shall be members of a labor union, and I should like to know, with those views in mind, what is the difference here between you and the representatives of labor unions.

Mr. GARY. The difference, first, is in the statement of facts. The labor unions secure as many of the employees in every line of industry as they can to join their unions. It is a misstatement of fact to say that they only desire or seek to secure a number of members. When they can succeed and they have the power by reason of the numbers of employees to compel the owners to contract with them in regard to labor, as they do wherever it is possible so far as my experience and information goes, then of course nonunion members can not get work in that mill except through the unions.

I should like to have you make as full an inquiry as you can, in this country or in any other country, and find if you can where contracts are made with the unions with respect to a number of employees, with the agreement that those who do not care to join or who do not belong to the union may come in and get employment. Now, if they have such contracts as that it is a recent thing, in my opinion, and in conformity to a scheme which has been told by some of the union labor leaders whereby it was stated that they would make an agreement whereby a shop might be partly union and partly non-union, because they knew when the contract was made for a part of the employees it would be a very short time when they would get them all in, and then they would insist upon their own terms.

Senator JONES. Then, Judge Gary, when you say that you have no objection to your men belonging to unions you only state that with reference to a degree of unionization, do you not? In other words, you are willing that some of your men should belong to a union, but not all?

Mr. GARY. No, that is not quite a fair answer—not quite an accurate answer.

Senator JONES. I am asking for the purpose of getting your views.

Mr. GARY. That is not quite an accurate statement. We make no question in regard to whether the men belong to unions or not. We do not ask for the number, we do not know the number, we have done nothing to ascertain the number, except as it comes from the statements, particularly laterly, from the men in the mills themselves who have said they did not propose to strike, they wanted to go back to work, they did not care to join unions, and there were not over 10 or 15 per cent at the outside who belonged. Those statements have been repeatedly told to us during the last year. But we never make any question, we never ask a man whether he belongs to a union or not, we do not know who does and who does

not belong to unions. Those men who were called yesterday and said they did not belong to unions at the present time and did not care to, I could not have answered, I did not know whether they did or not. Now, then, I presume that the local people who sent them here did know when the men came; they ascertained, because the chairman of this committee requested some nonunion men to be sent here. They knew, but I did not. We did not know previously. We never ask the question of a man whether he does or does not belong to a union.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say this, the committee wanted to hear both union men and nonunion men, and we requested from both sides of the controversy, nonunion men from the one side and union men from the other, so we could have it fairly reported.

Mr. GARY. Yes, of course that was the fair thing to do.

Senator WALSH. Judge Gary, let me see if I understand your position. You recognize the right of working men to organize?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. You have no objection to unions in your plants. Is that right?

Mr. GARY. I do not know what you mean by that.

Senator WALSH. You recognize the right of the men to form unions?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. But you refuse to confer with the representatives of the unions?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. That is right. Now, what good is there in men having the right to organize if they employer refuses to recognize their officials and confer with them?

Mr. GARY. What good is it to them?

Senator WALSH. Yes, of what value is the right of working men to organize if their representatives can not talk to their employer?

Mr. GARY. Could that not be answered by saying if 10 per cent. of the men can join unions and secure a contract with the employer, with the labor representatives of that 10 per cent. that they then should have the right by so doing, the minority, to drive or to force or to influence the 90 per cent of the employees to join the unions? Because that is the inevitable result. Would that be right?

Senator WALSH. But is not your position secure when representatives of organized labor come to you and you say they only represent 10 per cent, and you say to them, "I can not talk with you. I can not discuss this matter. you only represent 10 per cent of my employees, and I want the other 90 per cent represented or I have the right to assume they are not discontented." You could take that position, could you not?

Mr. GARY. In conversation, do you mean?

Senator WALSH. Is it not a question of fact for you to determine how many the representatives of organized labor represent.

Mr. GARY. Yes, quite right.

Senator WALSH. Not to assume they are a minority simply because you get letters from their representatives, and to take the position that they are only a minority. Is not that a fact which you could have determined after conferring with them? Men do not make public their membership in unions.

Mr. GARY. You will remember I said in my letter, they had said to me, "We represent your men," and I said that "I do not think you represent them." Was that not equivalent to disputing the fact?

Senator WALSH. But the union men in the shop, where they know their employer will not recognize their unions, do you think those men will make public their membership? Do you think your superintendents and foremen would know every man in your plant that was a member of a union when they knew that you were not in sympathy with unions?

Mr. GARY. I do not think that, but I do think that with ordinary years and intelligence, if employees came to him in large numbers so he knew they were a majority, saying they did not belong to unions and they did not care to have a small minority control a shop, I think he would get it that way.

Senator JONES. But your position is the same even if 90 per cent of your men were unionized you would refuse to meet and to confer with their representatives, as I understand you? Is that true?

Mr. GARY. I have not said so; I do not say that.

Senator JONES. Have you not said you refused to recognize the officers of unions, that you would not even talk with Mr. Gompers? Have you not said that here?

Mr. GARY. The trouble is you do not—

Senator JONES (interrupting). The reason you are not conferring with them is because you think they represent only a minority, or is it because you are hostile to the representatives of organized labor conferring with you? It is one or the other.

Mr. GARY. Senator, I refuse to change my thought or my expression, in substance, and that is that we refuse to do anything that will result in the closed shop as against the open shop, and that is where I stand. And let me add—

Senator WALSH. But, Judge Gary, do you mean to say that if these men represented 90 per cent of your employees, that you would refuse to confer with them because it might be a step toward recognizing the closed shop as against the open shop?

Mr. GARY. I have not said that. That question has not come up. It would be time enough to consider that—

Senator WALSH. But have or have you not said that you would not receive the representatives of organized labor?

Mr. GARY. No, I have not said that. You were not here—

Senator WALSH. But I was here all day yesterday and I heard you—

Mr. GARY. Were you here yesterday—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). I was here all day yesterday, and I would like to ask now the question directly, will you confer with any representative of organized labor or of an union attached to or connected with any of your establishments—yes or no?

Mr. GARY. Under any circumstances?

Senator WALSH. I mean here to-day or to-morrow, will you confer with them in order to try to settle the strike—

Mr. GARY (interrupting). I will not, because—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). Because it is a step towards recognizing the union, that is it, isn't it?

Mr. GARY. Because they represent a minority, a small minority. that is the reason, and because—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). Judge Gary, why do you not leave it to arbitration? Why do you not leave that question to the President of the United States, to find out whether they do represent a minority or not?

Mr. GARY. Do you mean at the present time?

Senator WALSH. Yes, at the present time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Senator—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). Why do you not leave it to arbitration? They say that they represent a majority of the workmen, and you say that they represent a minority. Why don't you let some third person hear the case itself and determine whether or not they represent a minority or a majority? Isn't that fair? You say that they only represent a minority, and they say they represent a majority, and they give us figures showing that they represent 150,000 or 200,000 men, and you say they do not. Let the President decide it.

Mr. GARY. They give you figures showing that they represent 200,000 of our men? I beg your pardon, but they do not. There are no such figures as that.

Senator WALSH. I do not remember the exact number, but a large number.

Mr. GARY. They are talking about the entire steel industry. I do not speak for a large portion of the steel industry, therefore I do not admit or contradict what they say.

Senator WALSH. Well, won't any honest arbitrator determine what is right, Mr. Gary?

If that is a fact, won't it be shown that these men only represent a small minority? You were not willing to confer with them, they say, and they say that they have a majority. If they have a majority, isn't it well for you to know it?

Mr. GARY. Just please let me answer that question, Senator.

Senator WALSH. Now, Mr. Gary, what I want to know is, if under any circumstances you are convinced that more than 50 per cent of the men are organized, and their representatives call on you, whether you would confer with them, in the interest of all concerned and in the interest of the public? Are there any circumstances under which you would confer with them—

Mr. GARY (interrupting). In the first place, Senator, I do not think that I am called upon to answer a question as to what I might do under other circumstances. But I want to first say to you that I am very sorry to differ with you or anybody else, or with a portion of the public—if there is any—in regard to not meeting these gentlemen who asked to meet me. I am very sorry that I have to differ with you—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). And I am very sorry for the hundreds of thousands of families who are suffering because of that.

Mr. LINDABURY. May I suggest, Senator Walsh, that you give him an opportunity to answer. You have not given the witness an opportunity to answer any question you have asked.

Senator WALSH. I beg pardon. Let us have your answer.

Mr. GARY. Nevertheless, I put ourselves squarely upon one issue, and that is the open or closed shop. Now, as to what will bring about

a closed shop, as opposed to the open shop, we must decide from time to time, depending upon the facts as they are presented.

Now, at this particular time, Mr. Senator, I think there are many things to take into consideration. You speak about the public and the public interests. I agree with anything and everything you might say in regard to that. I stated yesterday the public interest of course is the first and the highest consideration, no matter how it may affect you or me, or your company or my company. I wish to say that at the present time, in my judgment, based upon my information, upon careful inquiry, the union labor leaders, or some of them, acting upon existing circumstances, utilizing a comparatively small minority of foreigners, have brought about this strike, which is no more and no less than an attempt on the part of a minority to secure control over the interests of the large majority, including not alone the employers but the employees.

Senator WALSH. But you say that they only represent a minority, while the laboring men say that they represent a large majority, and here is a memorandum which was sent to me by one of them—I have not talked with them and do not talk with them—they say they represent a majority. Now, is there any reason why that issue between you should not be determined by means of arbitration, whether they represent a majority or not, or is it a fact that under no circumstances will you confer with them at all?

Mr. GARY. I beg your pardon, Senator, but I have not finished the answer to the former question.

Senator WALSH. Will you say that you will not meet organized labor under any circumstances? You can answer that yes or no.

Mr. GARY. I do not propose to answer it yes or no. I propose to answer the question, to complete my answer, with all due respect to you.

Senator WALSH. It seems to me that that is the issue. The whole thing centers around the question of what was the reason you did not see these men.

Mr. GARY. The rest of my answer is that if the minority could have succeeded in securing, in forcibly securing control, which I think was attempted, in my judgment that inevitably would have been the bringing about of the closed shop. And I therefore think at this particular time the conditions and circumstances as stated by an employee who was here yesterday—the man whom you summoned to appear before you—are different from any that have ever heretofore existed in this country. And I doubt if many people, possibly yourself, Senator—I dislike to say it—fully realize the danger of that securing of forcible control of the work.

Senator WALSH. I will say that I certainly appreciate that, and I also appreciate the danger of an employer not meeting his workmen that way.

Mr. GARY. His workmen? His workmen? I have not refused to meet our workmen; quite the contrary. I refused to meet outsiders with no interest in our works, and by their proclaimed attitude, with no intention of doing anything else except to organize and unionize the steel industry.

Senator WALSH. Well, I will close with the statement that as I understand your position you declined to see these men because you

believed that seeing them would result in a step forward toward adopting in your plants the closed shop, is that correct?

Mr. GARY. I can not answer that yes.

Senator WALSH. I understood you to say that; that is the inference.

Mr. GARY. I beg your pardon. I did not say it.

Senator WALSH. Didn't you say in substance that the reason why you declined to see these men was because you thought that it would be a step toward the closed shop, which you opposed?

Mr. GARY. You leave out various other things. They did not represent our men. They were outsiders, and there were only a small minority, in my opinion, of our men who belonged to unions and the large majority of our men did not care to have these union leaders represent them, would not have consented, and never did consent, as stated here yesterday; and our men were satisfied, a large majority of our men were satisfied.

Senator WALSH. I do not care to press it any further——

Mr. GARY. I want to apologize——

Senator WALSH (interrupting). Not at all, sir.

Mr. GARY. I did not wish to combat your position at all, and I am not trying to evade your questions.

Senator WALSH. I know that, and I have not tried to be disrespectful to you——

Mr. GARY (interrupting). You have been respectful to me and I want to reciprocate that.

Senator WALSH. And I will state that I have a very high opinion of you and I have an exceedingly high opinion of the way in which your company has handled labor problems, and I think that you deserve a great deal of credit, but what I am concerned about is whether or not, seeing some representatives of these men, it might have avoided this terrible and unfortunate strike.

Mr. GARY. I do not think so. I think it would have been the worst thing that could have happened to this country. I do not think you and I see this thing in exactly the same way. You believe it would have been in the public interest if I had seen them——

Senator WALSH. Yes, and then had stated, after you had seen them——given a statement to the public, "I have seen the representatives of these men, and I am satisfied they represent only a minority; I am satisfied that the demands they make of me are not in the interest of our working men or of the United States of America, and I refused to go a step further," it would have been better. The point I object to is that you anticipated everything that would be discussed at that conference and made a decision before you saw their representatives.

Mr. GARY. I think you are wrong in your opinion and you think I am wrong. I think what I did was for the public interest. You think it was not. I am sorry we disagree.

I believe that there is no difference between you and me in our opinion with regard to what really ought to be done at all times, first, for the public interest. But remember, Senator, I am in consultation with men who have had very long experience in regard to these matters, in dealing with the labor unions, and who are fully acquainted with steps that are taken from time to time. I have had 20 or 22 years' experience myself. I do not know but you have had just as much. If you have not, you are not as well



qualified to express an opinion as to what might or might not be the effect of doing a thing at a particular time.

Senator WALSH. I am frank to say that I have not, sir; but I have had the experience of a public man in knowing that harm or injury never comes to you from giving your worst enemy, or the man who has any proposition to submit, a hearing. That has been my experience in life.

Mr. GARY. Perhaps you have been quite fortunate in that regard.

Senator WALSH. I do not anticipate what the man outside the door is going to say to me.

Mr. GARY. There are times—and there are men—when I think you can not meet them with any good to yourself. It depends upon the circumstances and conditions.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Judge Gary, if I may, I will try to get the matter boiled down a little more.

While Mr. Fitzpatrick disclaimed any intention of insisting upon unionizing all of your employees, and while that question was not presented to you either directly or included in the 12 points which it was generally understood were to be discussed—

Mr. GARY (interrupting). Before that time, was that understood? Understood since, I think, Senator. I do not think it was stated then; I do not think these 12 points were ever heard of until after this strike was inaugurated. I never heard of them.

Senator WALSH. I thought they had been published in some way.

Mr. GARY. I think not, Senator.

Senator JONES. Then I will have to change my premise.

Mr. GARY. Would it be objectionable if I make a suggestion right at this point? Perhaps you will include it in your question.

Senator JONES. Certainly not.

Mr. GARY. These gentlemen had publicly proclaimed, at St. Paul and elsewhere; they had repeatedly said—they said it at Atlantic City—that they were starting out, that they had appointed these 24 gentlemen, representing the different organizations, to attempt to unionize the iron and steel industry. That was their proposition, and their only proposition, so far as I know. I knew in advance what they wanted and what they were trying to do, and I believed, as I said last night, this was a step in that direction. And in addition to that they did not represent our men. They knew they did not represent our men. If so, why were they on this campaign, which was immediately after that commenced, and which has been actively carried on ever since, by night and by day, by public meetings and otherwise, trying to organize our mills, trying to get our men to join the unions by threats or by promises, by anything and everything that is usually resorted to? I am not dealing in personalities; I have avoided personalities on this occasion; I do not care to have any personal controversies with these gentlemen.

Senator JONES. Then, Judge, if it is plain here now that they were not attempting to unionize all of the employees of the Steel Corporation, and bring about what you consider and term here the closed shop; if that is not contended for now, it is different from the situation as it presented itself to you at the time, is it? You were acting upon the theory that they were going to do that?

Mr. GARY. Senator, if they should say that now, the natural answer would be, first, why didn't they say that at that time? If they

had said it then or if they say it now, I would like to have you ascertain, not taking their word or my word for anything—I would like to have you ascertain if you can where they are operating, where they have contracts with a concern for the employment of men in that mill, a minority, a small minority of them only being members of unions, where an important shop is carried on, even up to this date when they are using these arguments, partly union and partly nonunion. I do not know of such. But I should suppose it is for this committee to ascertain those facts. I do not ask anyone to depend entirely upon what I say or upon what anyone else says in regard to this most unfortunate controversy.

Senator JONES. Perhaps we have reached a point here where we can get on common ground. If there should now be a disclaimer of any intention to put into force in your plants what you have called the closed shop, which other people would call the unionized shop, would you be willing to consider any matters on that basis, and talk with people about any of the subjects which have been suggested for discussion—the twelve points, for instance?

Mr. GARY. Senator, a statement of that disclaimer would not satisfy me; it would be contrary to anything that has ever been done; and I express the opinion that if they made such a disclaimer in good faith it would not be long before they would be eliminated from the labor union organizations, and other men, with different views, substituted to carry on the work of unions. I base my opinion on past experience in this country and other countries. The mere statement that such was their intention would not satisfy me. Indeed, as I have told you, I have been informed that it was their intention, in order to get control, and then do what was necessary later. That comes from a pretty important member of their organization, and I know he has made the statement.

Senator JONES. The statement made before this committee was that the question of the closed shop, in the sense in which you use the term, was not even mooted or suggested for discussion, and I take it from all of your testimony you have based your whole opposition to conferring on only two grounds: First, that you did not think they represented a majority of your men; second, that you thought that they were seeking to bring about this so-called closed shop. Now, if we can eliminate the closed-shop proposition, it seems to me that we ought not to be very far apart on settling differences with this number of men whom you designate as a small minority.

Mr. GARY. Will you tell me, if you please, Senator, how you propose to eliminate the closed-shop proposition?

Senator JONES. I must confess that I have had very little experience with these labor difficulties, and I would not know how to go about that in a practical way.

Mr. GARY. You see that is the difficulty. A mere statement that they are willing to eliminate the closed shop does not eliminate it. We must, I think, be governed by past experience, by the history of labor unions as applied to the closed shop, and by the history of strikes. I think we have reason to judge the future by the past always, unless conditions are changed.

Now, I have not a good opinion of the conduct of strikes by labor unions; I have not a good opinion of many of the demands which

have been made by the unions; I have not any faith in the claim now made by the labor unions concerning the present strike. I am inclined to think there are two elements in the American Federation of Labor, although I can not speak for them. They are fully competent to speak for themselves. And I am satisfied that in the way this campaign was started, has been conducted, in the effort to unionize the steel industry, which resulted in the securing of a small minority, and then by calling out the strike, knowing they did not represent the large majority of the steel people, and in the way the campaign has been conducted since, by threats, by intimidations, by assaults, which except for the courage of the officers of the law in vindicating the law, and with which and for which the steel industry has no responsibility whatever, except for the strength of the officers of the law in vindicating the majesty of the law, there would have been conditions in this country which you and I would have very much regretted.

Now, I hate to say that publicly. I have, as I say, avoided personalities; I have avoided references to this subject, which I think your questions have forced me into; but I can not deal with the subject under the present conditions from the viewpoint from which you discuss it. I believe under the existing circumstances that every member of the labor union who is fair-minded and honest and intelligent ought to have said, and to say now, that under the circumstances there must be no strike, there must be precipitated no trouble. Therefore, I can not talk about compromise or arbitration at the present time. And I say that regretfully, because apparently I am differing with sentiments of some of the members of this committee all of whom I very much respect.

Senator JONES. Judge Gary, so far as my personal sentiment is concerned, I made up mind to base it wholly upon the record which should be made in this case, regardless of any inclinations which I might have one way or the other; but, according to the record in this case thus far, the representatives of the labor organizations have come here and they have said that this question of a closed shop was not at issue at all, and you have come here and said that you are perfectly willing to have what is known as the open shop, which shall employ both union and nonunion labor. Now, the public is interested in this subject. This strike is a disastrous thing for the public, and I think measurably perhaps disastrous to the Steel Corporation, and may affect vitally some of the men who have gone on strike; and the object in bringing about this investigation, as I take it, is to see if we can not discover some common ground on which the interests of the public may be protected and the interests likewise of the Steel Corporation and of the men themselves subserved. We are not here for the purpose of taking sides one way or the other in this matter, but we are here for the purpose of seeing if we can not find some common ground.

Now, if I understood your latter remark, that there is only one solution of this thing so far as you are concerned, we might as well end this examination here. If you mean to say that the only solution is to let this strike wear itself out, so far as I know, you are in position to carry that policy into effect; and if that is your policy now, if you have no common ground to suggest, it seems to me we might as well end this examination here. But I am seeking, if possi-

ble, to find some common ground on which we can meet and serve the interests of the public and your company and the employees as well.

Mr. GARY. Senator, your statement is very clear and comprehensive. I think possibly you and I may differently interpret the public sentiment of this country, and if so you may be right and I wrong; but of course we are acting on our best judgment, believing we are as loyal and faithful in considering the rights and interests of the entire public as you are, although we are not disinterested as you are, I must admit.

Now, of course, the natural way to settle all industrial questions is to leave every one open and free to act on the basis of natural laws and regulations, so long as every one carefully observes the requirements of the law. I believe if the attitude of the public is to insist, first, upon observing the requirements of the law, of maintaining absolute peace, of preventing breaches of law and unlawful disturbances, so that every man and every interest is protected, that this whole difficulty will work out. I think people ought to be allowed to make their own agreements, their own contracts with their men. If one side or the other is transcending the rules of propriety and decency public sentiment will correct that evil. I believed in that principle when, at the beginning of our organization, we started out to give the public information concerning our operations and our management—when we permitted Government representatives to examine our books and our accounts from time to time, sometimes costing a good deal of money and occupying a good deal of our time. I think the strongest force we have in securing and maintaining peace and contentment is an enlightened public sentiment.

Now, if it is desired and found necessary by such as you to furnish additional protection to one interest or another, the foreigners or Americans, of course you can pass general laws for governing them. Speaking now only for myself, and not for the corporation—because while I have a good deal of authority and power I use the same very sparingly; I am in the habit of consultation—speaking for myself, I would not object to a law for Federal incorporation or license, which would result in the appointment of a disinterested commission, appointed by reason of their fitness, their qualifications, who should determine when and how and under what conditions a corporation should receive its charter or its license, and should have supervision over the management of the corporation, including even the labor questions; provided, however, that at all times the questions of principles, the fundamentals having application as determined by the law, might be reviewed by a legal tribunal, by a court, a Federal court with ample jurisdiction and authority.

I think the final decision of all these questions, industrial or otherwise, must be left to the courts of the country, those who are disinterested, who are impartial, who are selected because of their fitness to represent and carry into effect the principles of the Constitution and the law. I have no sympathy whatever with the statements which have been made by labor leaders in regard to the courts, when the courts have been condemned and criticized for their action; and I think it is as false as false can be to claim that the action or the decisions of courts as a rule have been partial and influenced by one industry or one interest or another.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, when you speak of this licensing system it is encouraging to hear you talk that way; but do you speak at all for big business on that? There are bills in Congress now for licensing that are fought by all the interests apparently in the country, as a wrong proposition to license them.

Mr. GARY. If the bills are substantially in accord with what I have said those who are opposing them do not represent my views. That is what I say to that. I think Federal incorporation would be better than license. Of course, if there is opposition it is on the ground that industries and individuals must be left untrammelled, absolutely free to do as they please, if they do not run counter to the law.

Now, that might result in increase in prosperity, progress and prosperity temporarily; but I do not think permanently. That is my own judgment about it.

I recognize that the power of concentrated capital necessarily involves the power to do more or less harm. I recognize the fact personally that concentrated capital has the advantage over a single individual, if the concentrated capital is in the hands of dishonest and unfair men; and therefore I think it is no more than right for concentrated capital to be subject to supervision and control against wrong—because the ultimate prosperity and happiness of a country depend upon a thing being right, fundamentally right. And in that connection I want to say I think to the same extent that capital is subjected to supervision and control by law, concentrated labor should be subject to the supervision and control of the law and the Government. I see no difference. Discrimination is the evil to be avoided. A fair chance, fair opportunity, equal rights to all men and all interests, is the object to be attained, in my opinion.

And I tell you this, Senators, because I want you to know what my views are upon the subject. I should like to have you know that I wish for the very same things which you gentlemen wish; I am no different from you. I base my opinions on conditions as they exist, upon the history of the past, upon what I think is practicable, and what is not; and I think I see dangers, at least difficulties, as connected with our business that one less experienced could not see.

I do not say this by way of apology, gentlemen, although I do apologize for seeming, perhaps to some of you, judging by your questions, to evade your questions or to antagonize your principles, which I do not.

Senator JONES. Judge Gary, I have been of course very much impressed in hearing this statement, and it undoubtedly furnishes food for thought in connection with possible future legislation; but of course it can not become effective in a way to settle this strike. And I do not care to prolong the examination, but I would like to ask you the general question, have you any solution to suggest for the settlement of this strike?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator JONES. I should be very glad to hear it.

Mr. GARY. See to it that in no place are the laws violated, that peace is continuously maintained, that individuals shall be left free to do as they please while they live up to the law; and then in that case the employees, who are the ones interested, will settle this question for themselves. Leave them to settle it. If you think at any time the employer, that is the United States Steel Corporation, is doing

the wrong thing, you come and see me and satisfy me if you can, and see if it is not corrected, unless I convince you it is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. You will meet the committee, will you, Judge?

Mr. GARY. I certainly will. I would meet the union labor leaders, as I am meeting them to-day or as I may meet them in the General Conference. I do not call that meeting them as union labor leaders. I have nothing against them personally.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure they have nothing against you.

Mr. GARY. Ask Mr. Gompers, ask any of them that happens to know me. I have nothing against them personally, as you know.

The CHAIRMAN. Why was it you did not answer Mr. Gomper's letter several months ago?

Mr. GARY. I thought Mr. Gompers knew perfectly well that I would not recognize him as a labor leader, he knew that by past experience, and he knew it by my answer to Mr. Tighe. If at that time I was discourteous to him I am very sorry; I did not intend it as a discourtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. His letter to you was courteous, was it not?

Mr. GARY. It certainly was courteous, but nevertheless he was asking something he knew I had just refused Mr. Tighe—at least should have known it. I assumed he did know it.

Senator WALSH. Judge, in a very kindly way, is not that statement which you have just made, that you refused to recognize Mr. Gompers in his official position, not unlike the attitude of the labor men who refuse to recognize you as a capitalist and denounce you because you are a capitalist?

Mr. GARY. I do not think so, Senator. Of course I allow your point to be made without discussing it, but I do not think so.

Senator WALSH. I am not in sympathy with their denunciation of capital, but I do not like to see capital feel that labor representatives or labor leaders have not any rights.

Mr. GARY. The union labor leaders have rights.

Senator WALSH. But you refuse to recognize them.

Mr. GARY. Of course they have rights. I admit that. And when you speak about laborers, their considerations are of the highest; they are of prime importance, higher than anything else except the interests of the general public.

Senator WALSH. Is it true, Judge, that capital has made mistakes?

Mr. GARY. Do I admit it?

Senator WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GARY. Certainly.

Senator WALSH. And it is true that labor has made mistakes, is it not?

Mr. GARY. Why, of course.

Senator WALSH. Now then, when labor thinks capital has made a mistake, and capital thinks labor has made a mistake, is not the thing to do to arbitrate?

Mr. GARY. It depends upon circumstances. If I should go to you, Mr. Senator, and say "I think you have made a mistake in regard to the treatment of your family," and you should deny it, and I asked for arbitration of that question, I think you would refuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator being a bachelor— (Laughter.)

Senator WALSH. I do not think the relationship between the employer and employee is that of a parent to his children, do you?

Mr. GARY. No, I do not. But I think the relationship between the United States Steel Corporation and its employees is pretty intimate and pretty friendly, and has been growing more so year by year and day by day. I believe a large majority of our people think that we treat them fairly, not in a patronizing way, not in disregard of their rights at all, but as associates in work.

I should like to read just two or three words here from something that has a bearing on the subject. In 1908, when the general solicitor of our corporation, under my instructions, called together the casualty managers of our different companies for the purpose of organizing, this is what I said to them:

Some of the gentlemen present, if not all of them, know that I am in hearty sympathy with the movement. We should like to take a prominent part, a leading part, in any movement and in every movement that is practical to protect employees of the different corporations in which we are interested, and any requisition which is made for the expenditure of money to install equipment to protect our people will be honored, and I do not hesitate to say that we expect our legal department, and the gentlemen who are subject to their control (because these casualties were under their control at that time), and direction and advice, to take such steps as are practicable to ascertain anything that can possibly be done at every locality and in every department to add to the safety of our equipment and to prevent accidents. Upon the ascertainment of the facts which enable the heads of departments to form an intelligent judgment, we should be glad to have recommendations made so that we shall have opportunity of finally passing upon the question involved. We will not hesitate to make the necessary appropriations of money to carry into effect every suggestion that seems to be practicable for the improvement of the conditions at our mills as far as our employees are concerned.

Then later, just two or three lines, from a letter written by me to some of them in 1912:

The United States Steel Corporation expects its subsidiary companies to make every effort practicable to prevent injury to employees. Much can be done by designing new construction and machinery with all practicable safeguards. Expenditures necessary for such improvements will be authorized. Nothing which will add to the protection of the workmen should be neglected. The safety and welfare of the workmen is the greatest concern.

You would be surprised if you could see just what has been done, and you would also be surprised if you knew what the percentage of decreases in accidents has been—the percentage has become larger and larger. In my different talks to our presidents and to the managers, whenever I have had opportunity, it has always been in the same direction of considering of first importance the best interests of our employees.

Now, I said yesterday we make no boast of that. It is only what we are obligated to do. I understand that thoroughly, and I also understand that it is to our interest to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Judge Gary, I would like to ask you a question or two with reference to the broader aspects of this question. You have undoubtedly studied the labor situation throughout the world, coming out of this war?

Mr. GARY. I have read the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. And I assume that you have given a good deal of thought to it?

Mr. GARY. Considerable. I will say, at least some thought.

The CHAIRMAN. Most thoughtful men are students of it. Before I ask that—I think you stated yesterday something about a plan of a shop union which you had developed in the different factories for the workmen to organize themselves.

Mr. GARY. I did not quite say that, Senator. I did say that a number of companies had adopted different plans which the labor unions are seeking to have abolished.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a plan in the shop itself?

Mr. GARY. And I did say that we have our own practice and have had for many years in regard to committees. And I further said, in substance, that we were watching all these things very carefully with a view of ascertaining whether they are beneficial to the men and satisfactory to them and of then determining what, if anything, we ought to do. Freedom to the men to work or not work is what we seek and what we insist upon.

The CHAIRMAN. You have realized, I take it, from some of your speeches which I have read lately that we are in a new world, that we are getting away from the old things and getting into new things.

Mr. GARY. I hope there is an improvement going on all over the world—I hope so. I am quite an optimist as to the future, and yet not quite so much so that I close my eyes to the possibilities of danger.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not believe in closing your eyes to the conditions in the world that are confronting us at the present time?

Mr. GARY. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. It is better to face these things than to bury our heads in the sand and say that we can not see them.

Mr. GARY. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. There is more or less unrest in our country?

Mr. GARY. Yes; more or less. I think it is less in this country, as compared with other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, certainly. But is that a symptom of a disease, or is it merely a sporadic eruption?

Mr. GARY. It is both. There have been decided wrongs; many of them have been corrected, many are being corrected. The war has inflamed and distorted the minds of men all over the world, and certain elements—I call them vicious—are taking advantage of these conditions to go beyond the domain of propriety to bring about revolutions, to bring about if possible the forcible distribution of wealth.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is not confined to agitation in this country?

Mr. GARY. No; it is very much worse in other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. You are familiar with the situation in England, I assume?

Mr. GARY. I am somewhat familiar with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with the bill now pending in Parliament for a Royal Industrial Commission which was proposed by Lloyd George last December?

Mr. GARY. I can not say that I am thoroughly familiar with the terms of it.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have heard of it?

Mr. GARY. Yes, I have heard of it. And of course there is danger of going to extremes, in all these things. Lloyd George, you know, is changing his views from time to time.



The CHAIRMAN. Well, most people do change their views, don't they?

Mr. GARY. Yes; I hope so. Some never change.

The CHAIRMAN. And Lloyd George—of course, in what you say you are not in any way reflecting on the man who probably saved the British Empire?

Mr. GARY. No. I would like to know what you think of the Lloyd George of to-day as compared with the Lloyd George of ten years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think a good deal of the Lloyd George of to-day.

Mr. GARY. So do I.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that bill in Parliament has been the outgrowth of conditions in England, and that bill provides for a commission with very great power, does it not?

Mr. GARY. I think it does.

The CHAIRMAN. It can legislate upon the hours of labor, the establishment of the eight-hour day; it has the power to fix the minimum wage in an industry; and it has the power to administer their old age pension act; and that is to be a permanent commission. The significant thing about that is that the majority of the members of that commission are elected by labor through their trade unions. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. GARY. I am, and probably the reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the reasons for that?

Mr. GARY. Labor unions are practically in control of the industries in England to-day, I am inclined to think; I am afraid they are. And if they have control I believe it is a very great hindrance to the progress, prosperity, and happiness of England. Of course I may be mistaken, but that is my belief. I think England is dealing not only with conditions of unrest, but with conditions which compel her to do things which are not the best things to be done. And I firmly believe, whether I am right or wrong, if labor unions had control of the industries of this country it would not only mean the closed shop, but it would mean the imposition and enforcement of conditions which would restrict output and increase cost and add to the expenses of living.

Now of course when there is only one thing to do, or when there are various evils confronting us, the position to take is the one least unfavorable; and, therefore I think England is inclined to go further than the people of this country would go, simply because she is compelled to do it, or else she feels she is compelled to do it. Now, just what she will do I am not competent to say, and in fact I do not think I want to express any opinion in regard to the English situation at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is indicative of the world movement, and don't you think it would be wise to meet these questions now in order to prevent a situation such as may develop in this country?

Mr. GARY. I think it is wise to meet any question that is forcing itself upon public attention, yes. I do not think we have any condition that we have to meet at the present time concerning the making of radical changes in the administration of our affairs, Senator. But I think if this matter now pending and under inquiry by your committee is allowed to solve itself without any breach of law

and without any interference, that the employees and employers will settle it.

The CHAIRMAN. Granting that is true, will that settle strikes in this country?

Mr. GARY. I think it will have a very, very decided influence on strikes in this country, particularly where they are brought about improperly or from improper motives. And anything that is done to encourage this particular strike in my judgment is the worst thing that could happen, because it would be playing into the hands of a vicious element that should receive no encouragement from men such as you, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you do not suggest that this committee is giving it any encouragement?

Mr. GARY. I certainly do not, Senator; quite the contrary, except by the investigation and then only to the extent, which has not yet been determined that this committee may encourage a certain vicious element which I do not care at this time to speak of or to characterize.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think we have reached the point in this country where a committee of Congress can not investigate a great public question for fear of inciting some seditious people?

Mr. GARY. That is a very broad question.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, it is, but you have made a pretty broad charge.

Mr. GARY. I will answer it in this way: That I do not think that the appointment of this committee or the proceedings of this committee up to date are at all objectionable or could be unfavorably criticised; nor is there any reason to expect that there will be anything of that kind. But the investigation—which I have not said was unnecessary or inadvisable—does give opportunity to certain men, not including those who have already been upon the stand, to air their views and to get before the public, a minority, a small minority of the public, certain propaganda that is vicious and calculated to do harm. I do not say that by way of criticism, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not mean that open discussion is not a good thing do you, Judge? You do not mean that views ought not to be expressed by people as long as they are not seditious?

Mr. GARY. As long as they are not seditious—no.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think it is a good thing to have a place in which to talk things over?

Mr. GARY. I will answer that in just this way, which I think will be plain, simple, and fair. I think if a man in this city were preaching anarchy, revolution, disturbance, destruction of property, destruction of life, robbing a man of his home and even of his family, that it would be quite improper and certainly injudicious for this committee to summon that man before it and give him an opportunity to talk on any subject. Now, I do not say that has application to this particular case. I am only answering your question.

The CHAIRMAN. Why I asked that was this: Men's views may be criticized by other men, perhaps fairly and perhaps unfairly. Now, I notice that on the floor of the Senate the other day your views in a certain speech were criticized very severely by a Senator.

Mr. GARY. You mean by Senator Borah perhaps, in regard to my not meeting these gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN. No; a speech you made that we should forsake the doctrines of Washington and Jefferson, that that was practically creating anarchy in this country—

Mr. GARY. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to have me read it to you? Perhaps that is pretty strong—let me read it.

Mr. GARY. He was discussing the league of nations, was he not?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARY. As you know, I am in favor of some league of nations, because it is a step in the direction of peace, which we all want.

The CHAIRMAN. But I am bringing this up on your theory now that when one individual has criticized another's view it is apt to lead to trouble, and we had better not have any investigation, but let everything go.

Mr. GARY. Assuming, then, for the moment that I am the kind of man I spoke of in the city of Washington, an anarchist, a revolutionist—

The CHAIRMAN. No; I do not say that.

Mr. GARY. It would not have any application to me; it might have perhaps to someone else.

The CHAIRMAN. He said in this speech referred to in the Senate:

It may not be out of place to mention that just 30 days, one month, from the time that Mr. Gary announced, amid his cheering banqueters, that the policies of Washington and Jefferson were out of fashion, Mr. Foster, with his red pamphlet in his hand, appeared at the door of Mr. Gary's industries, and knocked rude and long, and advised Mr. Gary that he accepted his proposition that the policies of Washington and Jefferson were out of fashion, and that he had another system to take the place of those policies of government.

Mr. GARY. You may think that that was a fair illustration, even in senatorial debate—

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know that it was.

Mr. GARY. But I think it was a far-fetched illustration. What I did actually say was that it was claimed that we should adhere to the principles announced by Washington and others against entangling alliances, and I said I was inclined to believe that a large majority of the people had reached the conclusion that that doctrine as applied to present conditions had become unfashionable, because we were entangled with other nations, and what we were trying to do was to become unentangled.

Senator McKELLAR. I believe the majority of the people of this country believe just exactly as you said, Mr. Gary.

Mr. GARY. Thank you, Senator. I think so, too.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not call attention to that in order to get into a league of nations discussion.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, we have got in, and since we have got in I think we might express our views about it. I indorse that view.

Mr. GARY. Thank you, Senator. I was about certain that I was right even before you expressed that view, Senator; there can be no question about it now.

Senator McKELLAR. I think a large majority of the people of this country agree with you just as you say.

Mr. GARY. I think we are going to begin to find that out because we are going to vote pretty soon.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't let us have a speech on that subject.

Senator McKELLAR. We may find it out this afternoon.

Mr. GARY. The country wants to have this question of the league of nations settled; there is no doubt about it.

Senator JONES. Judge Gary, referring to the—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Before you go into that, let this letter of Mr. Gompers go into the record. I think it was not put in the other day, Mr. Gompers's letter to you.

Mr. GARY. I believe that is a correct copy.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
THE ALAMAC HOTEL,  
Atlantic City, N. J., June 20, 1919.

Mr. ELBERT H. GARY, Chairman,  
Board of Directors, U. S. Steel Corporation,  
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Of course you are aware that upon the request of a number of men in the employ of the United States Steel Corporation, and realizing the need of it, the convention of the American Federation of Labor decided to respond and give such assistance as is possible in order to bring about more thorough organization of the workers in the iron and steel industry, particularly those employed by your corporation.

A campaign of organization was begun in June, 1918, and within that period we have secured the organization of more than 100,000 of the employees in the iron and steel industry. The prospects for the complete organization are, I am informed, exceedingly bright.

Of course, knowing the policy of the organized labor movement, I have the honor in part to represent, we aim to accomplish the purposes of our labor movement; that is, better conditions for the toilers, by American methods, American understandings, and not by revolutionary methods or the inauguration of a cataclysm.

We believe in the effort of employer and employees to sit down around a table and, meeting thus, face to face, and having a better understanding of each other's position in regard to conditions of labor, to hours, standards, etc., and after reaching an amicable understanding to enter into an agreement for collective bargaining that is to cover wages, hours of labor, conditions of employment, etc.

At the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor just closed, the committee reported upon the progress made, and I am instructed and authorized to suggest to you whether you will consent to hold a conference with a committee representing not only the iron and steel workers who are organized, but representing the best interests of the unorganized men in the employ of your corporation. The names of the committee I am asking you to meet are:

Assistant President Davie, Amalgamated Iron and Steel and Tin Workers.  
William Hannon, member executive board, International Association of Machinists.

Edward Evans, representing International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Wm. Z. Foster, secretary of the National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers and representing the Brotherhood of Car Men of America.

John Fitzpatrick, president Chicago Federation of Labor.

If you can advise me at your early convenience that the request contained in this letter meets with your approval and that a conference can be held, I am sure I shall be additionally appreciative.

Kindly address your reply, which I trust may be favorable, to the American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.

Respectfully, yours,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,  
*President American Federation of Labor.*

Senator JONES. Judge Gary, referring to the question of giving an opportunity to people to air improper views, I have heard it said that the Steel Corporation has been circulating or causing to be circulated, or making it convenient to be circulated, this book of Mr. Foster to which reference has been made in this hearing. I should like to know whether or not there is any truth in that rumor.

Mr. GARY. Senator, that is the first time my attention has been called to that. I do not think it is true. I would not say that individuals connected with the Steel Corporation may not have done that to some extent, although I have no information in regard to it. On the contrary, my advices have been that it is somewhat difficult to secure copies of that.

Senator McKELLAR. I hope it will be very much more difficult in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. GARY. So do I.

Mr. LINDABURY. I have shown my copy to all my friends, pretty nearly everybody I have met, and asked them what they thought about it, and I guess that is about what others have done.

Senator McKELLAR. I do not think it should be done by anybody.

Senator JONES. I do not either.

Mr. GARY. You have hinted at the idea which I had in my mind awhile ago about calling witnesses.

Senator JONES. What you suggested awhile ago was what brought this up in my mind, to make this inquiry.

Mr. GARY. I hope that has not been done.

Senator JONES. I hope so too.

Mr. GARY. Now that you have called my attention to that it gives me an opportunity to ascertain and correct it. I would not care to have it done. I would not give the encouragement even of noticing such a thing as that.

Senator JONES. I agree with you that this is not the time to inflame the public mind.

Mr. GARY. That is it.

Senator JONES. Or any part of it.

Mr. GARY. That is it.

Senator JONES. But as to my attitude in this hearing here, recalling the suggestions which you made awhile ago, I have received a letter from my home State rather taking me to task because, from the questions I have asked here, I was supposed not to be friendly to the labor side of the controversy, and from your intimation this morning I think it puts me in just the light I want to occupy, as not being friendly to either side for the purpose of this hearing.

Mr. GARY. That is fine.

Mr. LINDABURY. Against them both.

Senator JONES. Against them both.

Mr. GARY. I would rather say "friendly to both."

Senator JONES. Friendly to both, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you about this paper, Judge, whether this advertisement that I hand you is paid for by the Steel Trust, or the Steel Corporation, calling attention to the definition of syndicalism being given wide circulation.

Mr. GARY. This is the first time my attention has been called to this. Certainly it is not done by any authority of the Steel Corporation or its subsidiary companies, and I do not believe any of our people have had anything whatever to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is paying for it, do you know?

Mr. GARY. Certainly not our people, not our companies. I could only guess at it, and that would not be of much value. If I were going to guess at all, I would say by some of the citizens. But I do not know a thing about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if your company did not do it, that is all I wanted to know.

Mr. GARY. We would know it if our companies had done it. They have not done it.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not putting out any statements of that kind?

Mr. GARY. Nothing of the sort.

Senator JONES. Judge Gary, on yesterday you made a statement which was very interesting to me. You stated that the increase of wages had ranged from 89 per cent to 145 per cent. I would like to ask whether or not the Steel Corporation has any basis governing the raise in wages, why this difference in the increase in wages.

Mr. GARY. It depends upon the men and the business and the locations. For instance, the percentage of some increases may be smaller because the compensation received is much higher, or something of that kind. These things are attempted to be done equitably. I have not got one of our usual notices here, but we increased the rate of wages for instance about 10 per cent, that is the way we usually word it, to be equitably adjusted.

Senator JONES. Perhaps that will give us a basis for thought. When you make an increase of 10 per cent, why do you make that increase?

Mr. GARY. Because under the circumstances we think it is about fair. You remember, Senator, during the war prices were very materially increased, although it is fair to say that we stood for the lower prices in our considerations generally, and I think the War Industries Board will tell you that; but they were increased and the profits were largely increased. Then it seemed to me and others that it was only fair to give our employees what we deemed a corresponding benefit from that, and as our profits increased we would arbitrarily increase the wage rates. I have forgotten how many times we increased them during the war, but repeatedly, voluntarily—arbitrarily, but arbitrarily in favor of the workmen, intending to be fair and reasonable and to treat the subject on the basis of merit. The largest percentages of increases have been made to those receiving the lowest wages.

Senator JONES. Were those increases made because of the necessities of the case, the increase in cost of living, and so on?

Mr. GARY. Why, of course. We have taken into consideration the increases in our earnings, and have intended to more than keep pace with the increased cost of living, which we have done. And during the war we increased the wages—since the war commenced—I think eight times; always voluntarily; there never was a single demand made; and I am sure the increases were very gratefully received.

Senator JONES. Those increases, then, were made in part because of the increased earnings of the Steel Corporation?

Mr. GARY. No, they were made to more than cover the increased cost of living, and we were influenced by the fact that our increased earnings permitted us to do it. That is nearer an accurate statement. And we did take into account also the idea of giving them what we conceived to be the employees' share in the prosperity, which we always do.

Senator JONES. This question of wages is a very live one at the present time all over the country, and particularly here in the city of Washington; and I wanted if I could to find out whether or not the Corporation or you individually had given any study to the basic principles on which wages should be adjusted, what should be the measure of the wage.

Mr. GARY. Senator, I think perhaps that question could be answered by an address I made before the Trinity College last June on the Labor Questions. I attempted to cover that. I will be glad to leave a copy with you.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have it.

Mr. GARY. There is not much literary merit in this address, but nevertheless it represents my views as to the treatment of labor, the consideration labor is entitled to. That has been published and was not made for any reason except to express my views, the views I entertained in regard to labor, and which before have been expressed in principle perhaps more than once, probably several times, going back to 1904, I think that was the first address my office has on this subject of how to treat labor.

Senator JONES. We will not go into the matter at this time. I am glad to know that you have given such study to the subject, and perhaps in the conference next week, or some other time we may have further enlightening views on the subject.

Mr. GARY. I hope I shall not be called upon to say anything.

(NOTE.—The article referred to by Mr. Gary will be found in this day's proceedings at the conclusion of Mr. Gary's testimony.)

Senator PHIPPS. A comparison was made between the rates of wages paid by the Steel Corporation and those in the railway industry. Statements were made on both sides, for instance, that the steel employees received higher rates, while on the other hand it was stated that the railway employees receive higher rates. Do you know the facts?

Mr. LINDABURY. The table put in yesterday shows both.

Senator PHIPPS. That is already in the record.

Mr. LINDABURY. Yes.

Mr. GARY. That will give accurate information on that. The industrial rates, I think, are higher.

Senator WALSH. I understood you to say that there is one public service this committee can render, and that is to see that peace is maintained in the locality where strikes are being carried on—

Mr. GARY. I did not put it just that way, but the idea is—

Senator WALSH (continuing). And that any employee who wants to work can go to work unmolested.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Are there any localities in the United States where the Steel Corporation has plants located where peace and order are not being maintained by the local authorities at the present time?

Mr. GARY. I think it is very well done. Here is a telegram just received from President Williams of the Carnegie Co. I will read it.

PITTSBURGH, October 2, 1919.

Judge E. H. GARY,

Care J. B. Bonner, Washington.

A meeting of the workmen in our plant at Mingo Junction was called last night to determine whether or not they would return to work, and between 400 and 500 strikers from Steubenville, 3 miles south of Mingo, marched to Mingo and prevented the meeting just as James Brettell, chairman of the meeting and member of the Mingo Junction Civic League, under whose auspices the meeting was called, was about to call order. The Steubenville strikers were shouting strike, strike, we are for the A. F. L. The Mingo plant in all probability would not have shut down September 20 had it not been for threats and intimidation by the Steubenville strikers. According to Pittsburgh Dispatch this morning, one of our men was heard to say as he was leaving the vicinity of the hall, "So this is the way they demand the right of free speech. Well, I've been a member of the union for a long time, and this is the first time my eyes have been opened. It appears to me that after all some of us are fighting against just that which we say we're fighting for."

H. D. WILLIAMS.

Mr. GARY (continuing). I think the authorities are generally furnishing pretty good protection.

Senator WALSH. So there is nothing you want to ask of the National Government at this time in the way of protection?

Mr. GARY. No; there is not.

Senator WALSH. And the legal authorities and the governors of the respective States so far have been able to cope with the situation?

Mr. GARY. That is correct. And I believe the Government will respond to a call on the part of the governors. And it is that sort of sentiment that we would like to have every United States Senator, whose influence is very great, entertain and encourage. We must have order! We must have peace! Law and order are the things to be considered first.

Senator WALSH. And every man a right to work whether he belongs to a union or not.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Or whether he is on a strike or not?

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Senator WALSH. Unmolested?

Mr. GARY. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other Senators wish to ask further questions we are much obliged to you, Judge Gary.

Mr. GARY. Thank you.



*United States Steel Corporation expenditures for purposes listed below.*

	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916
Welfare.....	\$1,068,253.02	\$1,600,242.69	\$535,056.26	\$476,384.19	\$752,114.00
Sanitation.....	(1)	(1)	615,966.64	853,056.50	1,402,798.49
Accident prevention.....	595,649.18	660,593.84	565,334.03	608,644.28	848,079.63
Relief for injured men and the families of men killed.....	2,587,516.18	3,013,638.12	2,253,901.60	1,988,751.42	2,593,960.65
The employees' stock subscription plan (approximate).....	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,135,900.00	1,150,000.00
For pension fund payments in excess of income provided by permanent fund.....	132,479.37	159,306.94	216,954.28	335,870.89	361,988.47
Total pension payments to employees.....	358,780.92	422,815.14	511,967.90	659,389.42	711,130.33
For additional benefit payments and administration cost.....	56,175.52	43,222.42	55,621.85	32,874.13	32,032.84
For the creation of a permanent fund.....	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
Total.....	5,883,897.75	6,933,781.59	5,687,212.81	5,997,807.36	7,608,941.24

  

	1917	1918	First 6 months, 1919.	Total.
Welfare.....	\$1,652,956.42	\$3,142,899.00	\$1,493,241.84	\$10,721,247.42
Sanitation.....	2,406,951.68	3,145,174.89	1,538,507.31	10,062,455.59
Accident prevention.....	998,806.94	1,110,064.00	574,446.19	5,961,618.09
Relief for injured men and the families of men killed.....	3,171,994.88	3,336,559.38	1,969,100.57	20,915,322.80
The employees' stock subscription plan (approximate).....	1,175,000.00	1,300,000.00	700,000.00	8,460,000.00
For pension fund payments in excess of income provided by permanent fund.....	339,093.52	138,644.39	66,525.33	1,748,063.19
Total pension payments to employees.....	712,506.65	709,059.82	366,525.33	4,452,175.51
For additional benefit payments and administration cost.....	30,765.89	31,424.58	15,484.71	277,589.74
For the creation of a permanent fund.....	500,000.00	5,000,000.00	.....	8,000,000.00
Total.....	10,244,803.44	17,171,241.66	6,341,921.24	65,868,707.09

<sup>1</sup> These expenditures included in welfare for 1912 and 1913.

(The matters referred to in Mr. Gary's testimony, which were ordered to be made a part of the record, are as follows:)

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF STOCKHOLDERS OF THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 15, 1912.

HON. H. E. GARY,

*Chairman United States Steel Corporation,*

*New York, N. Y.*

DEAR SIR: In transmitting our report we desire to take this opportunity of recording our appreciation of the uniform courtesy extended to the members and secretary of our committee by the many officers of the corporation and its subsidiary companies, as well as by the large number of employees interviewed. Every effort was extended to facilitate our investigation. To the officers and employees one and all, we tender our thanks.

Respectfully submitted.

STUYVESANT FISH,  
THOMAS DEWITT CUYLER,  
DARIUS MILLER,  
CHARLES A. PAINTER,  
CHAS. L. TAYLOR,  
*Committee of Stockholders.*

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF STOCKHOLDERS OF THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

At the annual meeting of the stockholders of the United States Steel Corporation held April 17, 1911, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That the chairman shall forthwith appoint a committee of not more than five persons from the officers, or stockholders, of this corporation, to investigate and report to the finance committee, as soon as may be, but not later than October 1, 1911, as to the truth of the statements contained in a certain article appearing in the March number of the American Magazine, under the title 'Old Age at Forty,' and that such report, together with such comment as said finance committee may desire to add thereto, shall thereupon be printed and mailed to the stockholders of this corporation."

Pursuant to such resolution Hon. E. H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors, appointed the following committee:

Thomas DeWitt Cuyler, of Philadelphia; Stuyvesant Fish, of New York; Darius Miller, of Chicago; Charles A. Painter, of Pittsburgh; Charles L. Taylor, of Pittsburgh.

The absence of several members of the committee, immediately following its appointment, prevented a full meeting until October 31, 1911, on which date the committee met for organization, electing Mr. Fish as chairman. Between that date and January 12, 1912, several meetings were held, at one of which Charles M. Cabot, the author of the resolution, and John A. Fitch, the writer of the article, "Old Age at Forty," were present. They, with three members of the committee, held an all-day conference.

At the meeting held on January 12, 1912, William H. Matthews was chosen to act as secretary of the committee. Since that date he has devoted his entire time to visiting many plants of the corporation, has interviewed workmen, superintendents, and officials, business and professional men in the mill towns, and has been in conference constantly with one or more members of the committee.

From the data gathered by our secretary, together with that obtained by the members of the committee, who, accompanied by Mr. Cabot on the committee's invitation, visited many of the works in the Chicago, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh districts—giving to such inspection all their time from April 3 to April 12—the facts and recommendations which follow are submitted.

As a result of the several meetings held by the committee, for the study of the article under discussion, as also through conference with Messrs. Cabot and Fitch, it seemed that the main questions calling for consideration were: (a) The seven-day week, and long turn; (b) The 12-hour day; (c) The speeding of the workmen; (d) The repression of the men.

Before taking up these questions singly, we believe we but state the facts in saying that no one of these practices was inaugurated by the United States Steel Corporation. Rather were they in vogue, to a greater or less degree, in the various companies which were brought into one when the Steel Corporation was organized.

(a) *The seven-day week and long turn.*—Until recent years the seven-day week has been the general rule and practice followed in all operations which are necessarily continuous, particularly in that of blast furnace work. Nor was it always confined to departments where such continuous operation was a metallurgical necessity. Recognizing the harmful effects of such a schedule of work, the finance committee of the corporation, on April 23, 1907, adopted and transmitted to the presidents of all subsidiary plants of the corporation the following resolution:

"On motion, it was voted to recommend to all subsidiary company that Sunday labor be reduced to the minimum; that all work (excepting such repair work as can not be done while operating), be suspended on Sunday at all steel works, rolling mills, shops, quarries, and docks; that there shall be no construction work, loading or unloading of materials.

"It is understood that it is not at present practicable to apply the recommendation to all departments, notably the blast furnaces, but it is desirable that the spirit of the recommendation be observed to the fullest extent within reason."

While the efforts made by individual officials to carry out the recommendation of the finance committee resulted in some progress being made toward compliance with the same, in many plants it was disregarded in whole or in part. The explanation of this failure to detach from the steel industry the seven-day schedule of work may be best found, we believe, in that zeal of operating officials for output, exclusive of all other considerations. This being contrary to the

policy of the board, and at variance with the resolution of its finance committee, a telegraphic order of a peremptory character was issued by Judge Gary on March 18, 1910, to the presidents of all constituent companies, reading as follows:

"Mr. Corey, Mr. Dickson, and I have lately given much serious thought to the subject matter of resolution passed by the finance committee April 23, 1907, concerning Sunday or seventh day labor. Mr. Corey has written you on the subject within a day or two. The object of this telegram is to say that all of us expect and insist that hereafter the spirit of the resolution will be observed and carried into effect. There should and must be no unnecessary deviation without first taking up the question with our finance committee and asking for a change of the views of the committee which probably will not under any circumstances be secured. I emphasize the fact that there should be at least 24 continuous hours interval during each week in the production of ingots.

"E. H. GARY."

Whether viewed from a physical, social, or moral point of view, we believe the seven-day week is detrimental to those engaged in it. While not wishing to imply that the method adopted by any individual official or any combination of two or more methods would be the best to meet requirements in all mills, we are strongly of the opinion that no matter what alleged difficulties in operation may seem to hinder the abandonment of the seven-day week, they must be met.

The records of to-day indicate that with the exception of two or three plants, the seven-day week has been relegated to the past.

The resolution of the finance committee, as subsequently emphasized by Judge Gary, was strictly mandatory in character, and should, in our judgment, be absolutely enforced at all times, in all mines, mills, shops, railways, docks, and works of the Steel Corporation. Any tendency on the part of anyone to disregard the spirit or the letter of such order should be sufficient cause for removal from service.

Closely allied with the question of the seven-day week is that of the excessive hours of labor involved in continuous processes, caused by the changing of the working shifts from day turn to night turn, and vice versa. An examination of the time sheets of many of the mills shows that this practice has been entirely abolished in many of the departments and not in others. We recognize that at rare intervals there may come emergencies and unusual conditions that would make absolute enforcement of any exact schedule of work hours impracticable, a fact equally true in any field of industry and commerce. Our investigation, however, leads us to believe that it is feasible and practicable to eliminate the long turn formerly followed in the changing of shifts in continuous process work, and that it should be done. Further, that conscientious effort should be made by all to reduce to a positive minimum any undue length in work hours that emergencies and unforeseen conditions may sometimes demand.

(b) *The 12-hour day.*—To ascertain the number of employees of the Steel Corporation working on a 12-hour schedule (exclusive of officers, managers, and clerical forces), we have examined the records of 175,715 men. Of this number we find 45,248, or 25½ per cent, are at present working 12 hours per day. Generally speaking, the schedule of work finds its largest proportion in those departments which are more or less continuous, such as rolling mills, open hearths, and blast furnaces, where the percentage working 12 hours varies from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. The explanation of such fact may be found, partly, at least, in the introduction of a large number of mechanical improvements which have steadily cut down the exhausting drudgery and the severe physical labor that was characteristic of many of the processes in the earlier years of the iron and steel industry. The actual physical labor in many of the positions is, today, much less than in former years, this being especially true of the open hearth and blast furnaces, where the intermittent character of the work is such that there is less call for actual expenditure of physical energy than in many of the 8 and 10-hour positions.

Notwithstanding this fact, we are of the opinion that a 12-hour day of labor, followed continuously by any group of men for any considerable number of years means a decreasing of the efficiency and lessening of the vigor and virility of such men.

The question should be considered from a social as well as a physical point of view. When it is remembered that the 12 hours a day to the man in the mills means approximately 13 hours away from his home and family, not for one day

but for all the working days, it leaves but scant time for self-improvement, for companionship with his family, for recreation and leisure. It is important that any industry be considered in its relation to the home life of those engaged in it, as to whether it tends to weaken or strengthen the normalness and stability of family life. By a reasonable conserving of the strength of the working population of to-day may we be best assured of a healthy, intelligent, productive citizenship in the future.

We are not unmindful of the fact that the 12-hour day has, by its general acceptance and practice over a considerable period of years, become firmly entrenched, and that any sudden or arbitrary change would involve a revolution in mill operations. Nor are we at all sure that it would be possible for any one employer, or any number of employers, to inaugurate a shorter hour system, unless a similar policy should be adopted by all employers engaged in the same industry.

We do believe that following in the wake of other betterments of conditions in the steel industry there will naturally come a shortening of the hours of labor and the eventual abolishment of the 12-hour day, which will tend toward increasing the efficiency and resourcefulness of the working population and for that reason bring benefit to both employer and employed.

That steps should be taken now that shall have for their purpose and end a reasonable and just arrangement to all concerned, of the problems involved in this question—that of reducing the long hours of labor—we would respectfully recommend to the intelligent and thoughtful consideration of the proper officers of the corporation.

(c) *The speeding of the workmen.*—In the article which is under discussion, considerable criticism is made against the system of payment of wages by piecework. We do not believe that there has been evolved any fairer or more generally accepted method of payment for labor. Likewise, what is known as the "bonus" system, which has been largely employed by the Steel Corporation as an incentive to increase in output and efficiency, is objected to as tending to result in a system of speeding, harmful to the men.

That there is possibility of abuse in these systems is true. Have there ever been devised rules of procedure in any field of industry free from such possibility? Our observations of labor conditions in the mills of the Steel Corporation does not lead us to believe that there is either desire or tendency on the part of foremen and superintendents to pursue these policies to a point that would mean harm or injury to the men under their charge. It is, of course, within the province of the board of directors, and they should employ the necessary means whereby they would always be conversant with and able to promptly check any official who in his anxiety for output becomes disregardful of the possible injury to his men by overspeeding and excessive strain.

As general operating policies, we believe the "bonus" system and the payment of wages by piecework to be of advantage both to employer and employee, guarding as they do against that dead level of wages regardless of the ambition, the resourcefulness, the efficiency of the individual concerned. They are the exemplification of that esprit de corps that is essential to the success of all enterprises; they are but a part of that spirit of contest and competition that is characteristic of all American life, whether it finds expression in the schoolroom, on the athletic field, in the target contests of Army and Navy, or in the legitimate striving for "place" among workmen, foremen, superintendents, managers, and higher officials in any field of commerce and industry. Through their operation, the qualities of perseverance, ingenuity, and grit have opportunity for expression, development, and reward.

As stated above, these special bonuses are offered as an incentive for increase in output and efficiency. That they should find fair and just distribution among all whose efforts and labor contribute to any resultant increase in production or economies would seem to be a subject calling for consideration and action.

(d) *The repression of the men.*—The Steel Corporation has made efficiency the one standard by which continuance of employment in its plants is determined. If we are to understand the term "repression of workmen" as a criticism of an objection to this defined policy, then the implied charge is true. If, on the other hand, it involves the question as to what measures the officers of the corporation should adopt for the suppression of organizations that in the past have, at times, proved irresponsible and incapable of self-control, that have advocated and oftentimes insisted upon what are believed by many to be

fallacious theories and practices, then, at least, the charge may well be open to discussion.

As a committee of stockholders, we do not believe the final solution of the problems involved in this question has been reached. We do believe the present methods are preferable to the old for all concerned, and that the Steel Corporation, in view of the practices often pursued by labor organizations in steel mills in past years, is justified in the position it has taken.

That the method of employment of to-day must prove to be the best for the future is a question on which there may well be a difference of opinion. The interests of society and the community at large will not best be served by that type of mind, whether it be employer or employee, which bases action on the assumption that might makes right. On the contrary, the adjustment of the relations between employer and employee is a task for men of sound minds, reciprocal natures, broad sympathies and courage, men who believe that the future may be made better than the present. May it not be reasonably hoped that such men, whether they be officials or wage earners, may be more and more found working together to bring forward the day when employer and employee shall enter into a common administration of industrial interests?

In an article under discussion, "Old Age at Forty," mention is made of the general social welfare policies inaugurated at different times by the Steel Corporation. It would seem to be in the province of this report to briefly outline those policies, and to consider their value as affecting the relationship of employer to employee.

#### SAFETY DEPARTMENT.

It is not necessary here to trace the growth of the earlier efforts made by different subsidiary companies toward the prevention of accidents, to the time when they found their culmination in the organization of a central committee of safety early in the year 1908, which committee was given the power to examine all the various plants of the corporation, and as rapidly as possible to bring every mill to the highest possible point of effectiveness in accident prevention.

That committee has and is carrying on a determined and effective campaign for safety all along the line. Its work is considered as important a subject as any that the corporation has to contend with in the manufacture of its products. From the start it has worked on a sound, vigorous and scientific system of accident prevention.

The central office of the safety department is in New York, in charge of an acknowledged expert, with several assistants, and supplemented by local safety committees in each of the subsidiary companies, which, in turn, are supplemented by subcommittees of foremen and workmen all striving to safeguard the lives and welfare of employees.

During the years 1910 and 1911 there was expended \$1,750,000.00 for safety, and large appropriations have already been granted for a continuance of the work. Gratifying results have been accomplished, as evidenced by the fact that the percentage of serious and fatal accidents throughout all the plants of the corporation shows a decrease of 43 per cent since 1906. This reduction of serious and fatal accidents, based on normal number of employees (200,000) means 2,300 less in 1911 than 1906.

Prevention is but the first steps in the system of accident and relief work as carried on by the corporation. Nearly every plant has its emergency hospital equipped to render first aid to any workmen injured. Each mill has its surgeon and nurse to administer promptly the necessary assistance in case of accident, and the company provides efficient hospital treatment, either in its own hospitals or those of the community.

#### VOLUNTARY ACCIDENT RELIEF PLAN.

In spite of all precautions taken and all efforts toward prevention, there will occur many accidents in any large industry, involving temporary or permanent disability, and sometimes death.

To Andrew Carnegie, the steel industry is indebted for the first voluntary relief measures. In 1901 he created a trust of \$4,000,000, the income of which was devoted, within the Carnegie interests, to the relief of families from whom the breadwinner had been removed by accidental death, to the temporary relief of those employees meeting with work's accidents, and to the pensioning of superannuated employees, and those permanently disabled. From this fund

there was disbursed in nine years the sum of \$1,753,955.59 among 9,746 employees.

What has been the policy of the corporation in this matter of ameliorating the conditions which accidents often bring to the homes of its employees?

In May, 1910, it established a plan of relief whereby it made voluntary provision for the care and benefit of all employees injured, and for the families of those killed. In a report of this nature, we can not discuss the considerable detail of such a system. During the years 1910 and 1911, \$3,133,000 was paid in aid of workmen who were injured in the mills and to the families of those men who were killed in service.

In addition to this voluntary relief on the part of the corporation, there exist in some of the subsidiary company plants employees' beneficial associations for insurance against sickness and death from causes other than mill accidents. To the funds of these both the men and the company contribute, and in their administration there is a similar partnership. That there should be an extension of this form of insurance would seem to us desirable.

#### PENSIONS.

In addition to voluntary accident relief, the United States Steel Corporation appropriated in January, 1911, a fund of \$8,000,000 for pension purposes, which has combined with the fund of \$4,000,000 which had been established in 1901 by Andrew Carnegie, for the benefit of the employees of the Carnegie plants. The income from the aggregate amount is now being used for the benefit of all employees of all the subsidiary companies of the corporation. The pension obligations of those subsidiary companies, which had put into operation pension provisions prior to 1911, were assumed by and merged into the new fund.

The record of operations of this fund for the year 1911 were as follows:

Total number of pensioners Dec. 31, 1911.....	1,606
Total number of pensions granted during 1911.....	563
Total disbursements during 1911.....	\$348,480.37
Average pensions granted per month.....	\$20.75
Average age of employees pensioned.....	years..66 2/3
Average length of service of pensioners.....	years..30 4/10

#### SANITATION AND WELFARE.

We have found that much attention has been given to the matter of sanitation in many of the mills. Pure drinking-water systems, sanitary lavatories, locker rooms, shower baths, and other like provisions are being established in many of the plants. Not all have traveled as far nor as diligently along this line of improvement as we think they might.

Along the line of general welfare work, scattering efforts are being made in the way of providing places of recreation, such as club rooms, playgrounds, and other agencies for the families of employees. District nurses have been employed by some of the companies; sanitary engineers by others. Specialists have been employed to investigate and report on all questions affecting "social welfare." An educational movement along these lines is now being inaugurated, and when that same energy and uniformity of practice that is characteristic of the safety department shall have been brought to bear on the question of "welfare," either directly or by cooperation with agencies already at work in the towns, much of permanent value can, and, we believe, will be accomplished. With the question of shorter hours of labor is closely allied this one of providing means and places by and in which the leisure hours gained may be profitably spent. It is not a question for the Steel Corporation alone. Rather is it one to which society as a whole may well address itself.

During the year 1911 the corporation expended \$1,250,000 for this general betterment work.

#### STOCK DISTRIBUTION.

In the year 1903, a plan was inaugurated, under which shares of preferred stock were offered to all employees and which practice has continued yearly since. A premium of \$5 per annum for five years is paid on each share of preferred stock purchased by employees under this plan.

As of December 31, 1911, 24,588 employees were stockholders under this plan; their aggregate holdings amounting to 102,245 shares of stock.

In response to the 1912 circular concerning employees' stock distribution, the following table shows the subscriptions thereunder:

	Number of employees subscribing.	Number of shares of stock.
Employees receiving less than \$300 per year.....	15,349	17,233
Employees receiving \$300 to \$2,500 per year.....	20,096	35,255
Employees receiving over \$2,500 per year.....	1,501	8,866
Total.....	36,946	61,354

While in the mills, we have made special point to ascertain from the workmen themselves their attitude toward this plan, and we have found most of them well informed as to its provisions. Many with whom we have talked were holders of one or more shares of the stock. Our belief that the plan has encouraged thrift and stimulated the men to save was but strengthened by the remark volunteered by several of the men with whom we talked—that they “had never saved any money until they began this way.”

An impartial examination of all the facts presented in this report will show that much work has already been done by the United States Steel Corporation for the betterment of conditions under which their employees live and work.

We believe there is evinced a widening sense of social responsibility; an increased willingness to accept the heavier burdens and obligations which have come with the development of modern industry. Yet, not less evident is the fact that there is necessity for still larger accomplishment in the future. Elsewhere in our report we have suggested some of the lines along which that should be wrought.

It may not be amiss to say that the resolution passed by our fellow stockholders imposed a task upon this committee requiring much labor, careful investigation, and conscientious consideration. To approach the questions raised by the article under discussion with fair and open minds; to ascertain and present the real facts; to search for the practical, rather than the theoretical; to reach conclusions that should not be affected in any way by opinions gleaned from this or that possibly prejudiced source, whether of employer or employee—in that spirit have we endeavored to do the work intrusted to us. To that high tribunal, that final court of appeal—“public opinion”—we submit our conclusions and recommendations. The dissatisfaction and unrest which plainly exist in the industrial world to-day will not be lessened or removed by a policy that limits itself to a fault-finding, destructive line of action, but rather by one that will in tangible, definite fashion recognize and follow that constructive and conserving leadership of which we believe there is evidence, both in the ranks of employers and employees.

There may be those, perhaps, who will accuse us of unwarranted optimism in expressing the hope that the men who, in the manufacture of iron and steel have been so successful in the invention and application of wonderful mechanical appliances, who have won success in the administration of immense enterprises—that these same men will lead and achieve in the just solving of the social and human problems that in this same industry press for answer.

The publicity accorded by the Steel Corporation quarterly in its financial statements, and monthly in its tonnage statements, has placed it in this respect far in advance of other corporations, and by doing so has gained for it the confidence and trust of the public.

In conclusion, we respectfully recommend to the board of directors of the Steel Corporation that hereafter, and at stated periods, a statement shall be submitted to the stockholders, dealing with the questions discussed in this report, so that correct and reliable first-hand information may be available as to the advancement and betterments being effected in these equally vital and important fields of endeavor.

Respectfully submitted.

STUYVESANT FISH,  
THOMAS DEWITT CUYLER,  
DARIUS MILLER,  
CHARLES A. PAINTER,  
CHAS. L. TAYLOR,  
Committee of Stockholders.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 15, 1912.

[Extracts from remarks made by Mr. E. H. Gary at a luncheon given to certain iron and steel manufacturers at the Metropolitan Club, New York, May 29, 1911.]

I have urged you to remember and I again call attention to the fact that when you make substantial reductions in your prices, if you reduce to a price that is unfair and unreasonable and you make so small a profit that it does not yield you a fair return on your investment and your risk, you at least place for consideration before everyone the possible necessity of reducing the cost of production, including prominently, if not principally, the wages which you are paying, or may be allowed to pay, to the man or men in your employ. Do not forget that the laboring men—the employees of the corporation—have more at risk, when these questions are considered of reducing prices below what is reasonable and fair, than the employer, because it is just as natural as it is right and fair that if reasonable profits are prevented and your prices are put down below what they ought to be, then as a matter of necessity you are forced to consider and perhaps decide in favor of a liquidation of the wages of your employees; and you have no right to disregard them and their interests. You have no right to run the risk of being compelled to put their wages below what they ought to be unless you are driven to it, and I hope, under the present circumstances, gentlemen, that whatever may be done, or whatever may happen as a result of present conditions, you will not reduce the wages of your employees until you feel it is an absolute necessity to do so.

We should undertake to place ourselves on a plane much higher than the demagogue or the reformer who attempts to assail us and who pretends to be the champion of the laboring man. We do not need any suggestions from people like that. We know what our duty is, we know what the rights of our employees are, and we feel obligated and take pleasure in knowing that we are at all times doing all we can for the people in our employ in keeping their wages up and in bettering their condition and keeping them in a position where they may enjoy life. We are the ones to lead in this movement. So, gentlemen, I bring this up because I have read in some of the newspapers that there will undoubtedly soon be a reduction in wages and we may be forced to it. I shall regret it if we are—but, gentlemen, let us not come to the conclusion of reducing wages until we are compelled to do so. Let us keep them as high as we can just as long as we can.

[Extracts from remarks by Elbert H. Gary, chairman, to the presidents of the subsidiary companies, United States Steel Corporation, Empire Building, New York, Oct. 19, 1911.]

I hope also that you will take especial pains to conciliate and promote the best interests of your employees. I consider this of the highest importance. \* \* \* It is more important all the time that we do the right thing concerning all the interests in our charge than it is that we make a good deal of money. \* \* \*

[Extracts from address by Mr. E. H. Gary, president, at the second general meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, May 17, 1912.]

During the year we have established and maintained a department of welfare work which has been under the immediate direction, so far as the institute is concerned, of Dr. Darlington, who is the representative of a committee on welfare, made up of seven members of the board of directors. This committee has been making very substantial progress in the direction of bettering the conditions of the workmen. I quote from the secretary on this subject:

"Already the seven-day week has been practically eliminated in all the larger plants of the iron and steel industry, even in the continuous operations where it had been regarded as unavoidable. Much thought has been given to the question of hours of labor and better conditions are being gradually worked out. The prevention of accidents has been investigated and safety devices costing vast sums of money, but worth all they cost in prevention of accidents, have been installed. A beginning has been made in building up a museum of safety devices, where the best things of the kind known in the world can be seen and studied by members of the institute. In more and more of the companies, sanitary officers are being appointed, and the health of employees is having more consideration than ever before. Hundreds of thousands of health circulars have been sent out by the institute. A monthly publication to serve as a medium of communication with its members has been authorized by the directors, and the near future will see the beginning of its publication."



As you know, your president a long time since at one of our meetings took a decided stand with respect to what should be the attitude of the employers of labor toward the employees. And I am glad to say that the directors of the institute, and other members of the institute, and the employers of labor generally who are connected with this industry, have fully supported all that has been said and every action that has been taken in favor of establishing and maintaining a position and a comprehensive work which is calculated to promote the welfare of the workmen. It is true that we sometimes read in the newspapers criticisms which are unfavorable, but which misrepresent the facts. As a rule the newspapers are fair and considerate and mean to publish the truth and to do the right thing; but like all others who are compelled to rely upon information which is gathered from various sources, they are frequently imposed upon, and do an injustice to those who are affected, without intending to do so. We have been fortunate in having connected with our efforts editors of the principal trade journals, who have always been fair and accurate in their statements. Nevertheless, at times, by reason of misrepresentation made to some of the other newspapers, or as a result of public addresses by men who are careless of their statements or by those who are not inclined to be accurate, and whose efforts seem to have been to excite a prejudice on the part of employees, some of the leading employers in the steel industry have been accused of ill treatment to their workmen. But I make the assertion, gentlemen, that in no line of industry, at any period in the history of the world in any country, was labor on the whole better treated in every respect than it is at the present time by the employers of labor in this great line of industrial activity. [Applause.]

[Extracts from remarks by Elbert H. Gary, chairman, to the presidents of the subsidiary companies, United States Steel Corporation, Empire Building, New York, Dec. 19, 1912.]

I think I may say the disposition and policy of the corporation is to consider the question of the amount which should be paid to the workmen from the standpoint of what is justly due him. What is he entitled to receive in wages, taking into account the labor he renders, the risk he runs, the position he occupies, the benefit he gives you, and the necessities which he is compelled to meet in his daily life? And all this from the standpoint of fairness and liberality. I do not think you should consider the question as to whether what you do is appreciated or not, even by the workman; or whether you receive fair treatment from him or from anyone else. It is not important whether in the press or in the public declaration of orators you are fairly treated or not. It is a question simply as to whether or not, when you consider the success of your corporation and the merits of the workman who does so much to make its business successful, you are giving him a reasonable division or share of the profits which are realized. I do not care whether the question is considered from the standard of good morals or not, so far as its decision is concerned, although that would be a sufficient basis. I believe, from the standpoint of what is for the best interests of your companies and of this corporation and its stockholders, it is wise to deal with your workmen not only fairly but liberally.

[Extracts from remarks by Elbert H. Gary, chairman, to the presidents of the subsidiary companies, United States Steel Corporation, Empire Building, New York, Dec. 17, 1913.]

The word necessary as applied to expenditures perhaps is very comprehensive, but necessary expenditures should always be made. Foremost under that head I would say any money you can pay out to increase the safety of your employees is necessary and proper. Never hesitate to request appropriations for expenditure of money which is calculated to prevent accidents to your employees. Keep that thought uppermost in your minds and remember that any such request will be promptly approved. \* \* \* Certain it is that your employees as a rule have shown you in many ways that they are grateful for what you have done for them; and it is a pleasure to be connected with the business when you consider that, departing from the general rules which have obtained between employer and employee throughout the world, you have by your treatment of these questions established the relations which now exist between you and your employees.

Now, you will have some occasion perhaps during the immediate future to consider further some of these matters and they may involve considerable

cost. If so, I should consider the money well expended. It is even possible that there may be some distress among some of your employees or those who have been your employees but who are out of work, or in the families of these men. I hope you will make an effort to keep posted. I trust the presidents themselves will take occasion to visit the places where these families live, to ascertain how they are getting along and if necessary to prevent suffering on their part that you be willing to contribute for the relief of these people. Some of these families are occupying our houses, and while out of work they may be unable to pay rent. In such cases leave the families in the houses; suspend the rent until they are able to pay it. The amount of money involved is of slight importance as compared with your duty and your pleasure as big, broad employers of labor. As suggested, you may have to relieve more men, but do not interrupt their employment unless, and until, necessary. Where you can utilize their services without great loss to your business, do it. If you can keep the men at work to some extent around the mills, cleaning up, putting your properties in condition, I would do so. You may expect to meet considerable loss during the coming winter but if in so doing you have added to the relief, benefit, and comfort of employees, who in the nature of things, are more or less dependent upon you it should be a pleasure.

[Extracts from remarks by Elbert H. Gary, chairman, to the presidents of the subsidiary companies, United States Steel Corporation, Empire Building, New York, June 25, 1914.]

I have this to say: When we feel we are required to take any action we dislike, whether it is in competition with other manufacturers or whether it is in reducing the wages of our men, then it is soon enough for us to dispose of these questions. When we feel we are forced to do a thing in self-defense then we have no right to shut our eyes to the facts. But until we believe it is imperative to reduce the wages of our men, I hope we will not do it.

[Extracts from address by Elbert H. Gary, at the alumni dinner of the University of Pittsburgh, at Pittsburgh, Pa., Feb. 26, 1915.]

Is the employer of labor treating his employees fairly and decently, or does his financial success depend largely upon inconsiderate treatment of his men?

[Extract from statement of conditions and prospects, by Elbert H. Gary, chairman, United States Steel Corporation, Thursday, Jan. 6, 1916.]

We must work together and for the good of all. It is a time for patriotism and for the exercise of a fair and liberal treatment of all others by each individual and by our community of individuals.

[Extracts from address by Elbert H. Gary, president, American Iron and Steel Institute, at annual meeting, New York, May 26, 1916.]

The business fraternity embraces the ones who provide capital or have charge of a business and those who are designated as employees or wage-earners. Both strive for the success of a given enterprise and the results affect the personal welfare of each. Their interests are identical so far as disaster or success to the enterprise is involved though efforts are not infrequently made from unworthy motives by outsiders to create an impression to the contrary.

[Extracts from remarks by Elbert H. Gary, chairman, at the annual meeting of the stockholders of the United States Steel Corporation, Apr. 16, 1917.]

Our effort has been to steady conditions as far as we legitimately could, to keep as many as possible of our men employed; to give them fair wages and fair treatment. And I think I may say, without being charged with boasting, that we have tried to treat the general public fairly in every way, by keeping it informed as to what we were doing and by conducting our affairs in such a way as to be of no injury but rather a benefit to the general community.

We have at the present time about 270,000 employees, made up of a great many different nationalities. From time to time efforts have been made by outsiders to create dissension, to instill a feeling of animosity on the part of our men against our corporation. But these efforts have failed. I say we are proud of this condition. But in saying that, I do not mean to suggest that we are entitled to any particular credit for it. Far from it. We have tried to treat our men justly and liberally and as one man ought to treat another man, but not simply because of our high regard for them, which would be reason enough, but also because we realize as a business proposition it is for our interest to do so.

Before the meeting is over I am going to ask one of our employees to say something to you. Some of you have heard him before. I did not know he was coming to this meeting, but I see him in the back of the room. He comes from a distance. He is also a stockholder. About fifty or sixty thousand of our employees are stockholders in the corporation. They are our partners; they are landlords, so to speak; they are men of property; they are substantial citizens; they are interested in the corporation and they are interested in our country; they are a benefit to the State and the Nation, and we are very proud of them.

We sometimes receive letters from stockholders complaining because we pay too large wages, and the suggestion is occasionally made, I am sorry to say, that we had better give to the stockholders in dividends a part of the money which we are paying the employees. I have one answer only to make to those stockholders, that when we protect and promote the interests of the employee we are protecting and promoting the interests of the stockholder. It is decidedly to the advantage of the stockholder to have an organization that can retain in its employ hundreds of thousands of men who are satisfied with their condition and who consequently are doing everything possible to protect and benefit the corporation.

[Extracts from address by Elbert H. Gary before the Commercial Club of Chicago, Blackstone Hotel, Jan. 5, 1918.]

The labor question is one which employers are sometimes reluctant to discuss for fear of misinterpretation of motives, but in war times every question which bears vitally upon the conduct and termination of the war should be considered frankly and fairly by the employer, the employee and the public generally. Each is equally interested. Each is entitled to protection and the rights of none should be neglected, although the necessities of the general public are always of primary importance.

Least any one might conclude that I have in any respect changed by views as heretofore expressed concerning labor generally, I may be permitted to say: Workmen should always have fair, just and liberal treatment. They should be paid good wages, taking into account the service rendered and all conditions which reasonably apply. The welfare, safety and health of the men and their families should receive careful attention by employers.

Relief funds for the result of accidents or old age should be established. All men, of all grades, ranks and nationalities, should be permitted to work when and where they please and on terms that they agree to. The laws should impartially protect both capital and labor and permit imposition or abuse by neither.

[Extracts from impromptu remarks by Elbert H. Gary, chairman, at the annual meeting of the stockholders of the United States Steel Corporation, Apr. 15, 1918.]

\* \* \* And first of all of course is the employee; we intend to treat him fairly and liberally; we recognize him as the most important part of our organization, it does not make any difference whether he is a skilled employee, whether he is an official or whether he is what may be called a common laborer; we recognize his rights and claims, and we believe that in treating him fairly and justly, in looking after his welfare, in making the living conditions for himself and his wife and his children better we are serving the stockholders and doing what is best for the corporation itself. And we intend to be just as loyal to our employees as the employees are to us.

[Extracts from minutes of meeting of steel manufacturers at Waldorf-Astoria, New York, Aug. 28, 1918.]

We are desirous of cooperating with governmental agencies so far as practicable. Labor problems are the most delicate of any. We have experienced little difficulty in our own labor matters during a good many years, and we dislike very much to see any agitation which is calculated to disturb our relations.

The first question which I refer to and which has given us more or less cause for deliberation relates to the principle of what we term an open shop. In our line of business we generally have stood for the open shop because we know that it is the desire of most of the working people; they wish for an opportunity to work when and where and on terms which they decide are advantageous to them. We know if left to themselves to pass upon this question a large majority, taking the advice of their own consciences, their own judgment, their families, and their pastors, and other good and honest and disinterested citizens who are their friends, would decide in favor of the open shop as being for

their best interests and particularly in times like these, and also of securing the largest production, which is the all important point.

The other question, which most of us at least deem very important, is the one of the eight-hour basis with what is designated "time and a half pay" for the hours over eight. I am not speaking of anything controlled by law, by statute. We have stood firmly against that basis; and because many of us have believed it was founded in sham and hypocrisy. It has never been advocated from the standpoint of what had been published as the real reason, namely, securing for the workmen less hours of work during a single day; nor for any reason, except under the false pretence of securing larger pay for work actually done.

The employees would not be satisfied with confining their labors to eight hours. If your employees were not permitted to work more than eight hours in one day and could secure, at another place, the opportunity to work more than eight hours per day at the same rates per hour, as a rule they would leave your employ and enter the employ of the other. We all know that by practical experience. So it is only when the man can secure as much compensation for eight hours as he could for more hours at another place, that he prefers that basis. In other words, the argument to the employee is that he can get more money on that basis, and the reason given to the public by those claiming to represent the workmen is that the basis is urged in order to provide less working hours for the workmen.

We make no objection to any man urging that he is entitled to higher wages, larger pay, and giving the reasons for it, if it is put on the ground of securing more pay; but we have objected to outsiders undertaking under a false pretense, to introduce a basis which, as I have said, misrepresents the truth.

Another reason we object to it is we know that as a total result of that standard of labor there is bound to be restricted output, less production, less success in our endeavor to assist the Government in providing its military necessities.

I have adverted to the laboring men. Who are they? I should like to have someone, if he can, draw the distinction between a labor man and others. I should like to go through this assemblage of men who have established themselves in high positions in the industry and ask them where they started; if each was born with a golden spoon; I would like to ask you if you did not start as laboring men, and if you have not continued to be laboring men ever since. I ask you successful men, who work with you brains, if you please, at the present time—the hardest kind of work—how many hours a day you work; and I might add, per night? I inquire whether you worked any harder on the farm or in the shop than you are working in the office to-day? I ask Mr. Farrell, hard as he worked in the mill when a young man, aspiring to reach a better position, if he really labored any harder or any more hours per day than he does at the present time in his office—yes, and in his home, after he leaves his office?

The laboring men, so-called, at the present time, as a rule, do not desire to remain in their positions. With proper encouragement and proper treatment they advance from position to position until they occupy other positions, which afford higher pay; but they are laboring men still. I do not believe any of them works more hours or harder than I did as a lad on my father's farm.

Now, the laboring man, so-called, I do not treat in my conversation or in my remarks or in my thoughts as a menial, as a subordinate, as one subject to my instructions; I consider him an associate, one of us; and I stand for fair treatment of the working man always. I want him to have the opportunity to reach the highest point in the business he is connected with, and I wish him to have his fair share of the proceeds of the business I am connected with—always. It is sometimes difficult to reach that point, to understand fully what it is, but I think in the offices of you gentlemen—presidents of your great concerns—the welfare and interests of your employees are in your minds and in your hearts, and you intend to give them liberal treatment.

[Extracts from proceedings of meeting of the presidents of subsidiary companies, United States Steel Corporation, at Empire Building, New York, Jan. 21, 1919.]

Judge GARY. I am desirous of bringing up for consideration and discussion this whole question of welfare work which has occupied so much space in our talks during these many years. All of us experience more or less a thrill of pride in hearing from Government officials that our reputation for considering and promoting the welfare of our employees is the best in the entire industry.

I may say without going beyond the bounds of truth that it has been very gratifying to me, and I think I may include all other officers and the directors

and members of the finance committee of our corporation, that our presidents are devoting so much intelligence to the question of protecting the lives and health and the happiness of our workmen and their families. If we are entirely frank we must admit that all of us during the last 20 years have been growing up into a higher plane with respect to these labor questions. The policies which obtained many years ago between employer and employee have largely been abandoned, certainly they have been changed in this country at least, and largely by reason of the attitude of you gentlemen and the results which have followed.

There was more or less reason for the conditions which prevailed in the long past. They were inherited, they went back to the time when laws were passed more or less for the benefit of the employer, because those who passed the laws were largely employers, those who were occupied in legislative positions; and consequently there was not only much complaint and opposition on the part of the employees, but there were generally some reasons for those complaints. And so it came to be that the employer and the employee looked at these questions from an entirely different standpoint; they dealt at arms length; their opinions were partisan, their action was partisan, each one seeking to not only protect his interests but to secure more than he was entitled to; and of course because of the fact that the employer, as a rule, had a better education and was therefore more enlightened, his conduct was better by comparison than the conduct of the employee who was uneducated, illiterate, uninformed, and very frequently unable mentally or otherwise to controvert the claims which were urged by the employer. The latter therefore went to the extreme of using brute force to secure what he believed to be his right. And it was the fact that in a majority of cases the employee was wrong and used the club or the gun or the torch to protect himself as he believed, going beyond the domain of propriety or legality. In open defiance of the laws he attempted to secure what he desired.

It is not necessary for me to say that those conditions and reasons have passed away; the world I am glad to say became better educated; the masses of the people we talk about now are made up, in some places, of ignorant men, perhaps more in proportion than the employers, referring to the former case of the employees, yet all in all throughout the world we have reached a point where the employers believe as a matter not only of justice and right but as a question from the standpoint of good citizenship, and further from the standpoint of good policy, that it is desirable to treat the workman as he would like to have the workman treat him.

And in commending you gentlemen for what you have done in this regard, for changing the situation between employer and employee, I only do the same justice that would be done if I congratulated you on managing your mill or your engine or your machinery in such a way as to secure the largest products and results.

I have said before, and you will pardon me, for repeating the point, that in my judgment there is only one way of combating and overcoming the wave of unrest in certain locations which some public speakers nowadays seem to take delight in referring to publicly, and which I think ought to be treated carefully in giving public expression, but which in our own private circles we have no right to shut our eyes to. The only way of combating and overcoming that, if it is done successfully, is for the employers, the capitalists, those having the highest education, the greatest power and influence, to so manage their own affairs that there will be left no just ground for criticism on the part of those who are connected with the movement of unrest, or of the very large class of people, many of whom are highly educated, who stand between the different forces and who look upon the question with the idea of trying to ascertain the right and the wrong of reaching a verdict and of establishing a public sentiment which shall have an influence in the direction of satisfying all concerned, all interests, that it is better to work together, and of dissipating the claim and thought that there is an effort being made on the part of capital and wealth to oppress, injure, and wrong.

I have been particularly interested lately in this question of welfare. In Pittsburgh my attention was called to some of the things the Carnegie people were doing for the entertainment and benefit of their workmen, and for becoming better acquainted with them, drawing the workmen and the foremen and others together and finding out personally just what they were doing and how they felt. I have been very much interested in looking up some of

the societies which have been formed in the different companies for taking care of the workmen and their families, the National Tube for instance, and latterly the Good Fellowship Club of the Minnesota Steel Co. at Duluth. I was somewhat surprised to find what good work they were doing among themselves, without any help, contributing out of their own pockets to a fund, which by a carefully selected board was distributed in time of sickness and necessity. I think it is a splendid thing, and I am inclined to think there ought to be more work of that kind in the companies. Notwithstanding all you have done, I believe the work can be extended. And it seems to me it might be advisable for our companies to help those societies to some extent. If I were president of a subsidiary it seems to me I would go to the officers of such an association and find out how they are progressing, whether they need any more money or not, whether the workmen and their families are appropriately and efficiently cared for. And, if necessary, the company might contribute to the fund.

And in keeping out of trouble there is nothing we can do better than to be sure we are liberal in the protection of our workmen and their families.

Above everything else, as we have been talking this morning, satisfy your men if you can that your treatment is fair and reasonable and generous. Make the Steel Corporation a good place for them to work and live. Don't let the families go hungry or cold; give them playgrounds and parks and schools and churches, pure water to drink, every opportunity to keep clean, places of enjoyment, rest, and recreation; treating the whole thing as a business proposition, drawing the line so that you are just and generous and yet at the same time keeping your position and permitting others to keep theirs, retaining the control and management of your affairs, keeping the whole thing in your own hands, but nevertheless with due consideration to the rights and interests of all others who may be affected by your management.

[Extracts from remarks by Elbert H. Gary before the Industrail Board of the Department of Commerce at meetings in Washington, Mar. 19 and 20, 1919.]

Judge GARY. You have no intention of unnecessarily doing anything to bring disaster or even damage upon the producers of iron or steel, if for no other reason, because you could not do it without at the same time injuring labor; and everyone of us believe that we should not purposely do that. I think the time has passed when the employers of labor are disposed to treat employees at arms length. I believe employers understand that it is for their interest to be abundantly fair with their men, and from the motive of doing what is exact justice and regardless of the fact that many times, when labor has had the advantage, it has been unfair, unreasonable, and sometimes tyrannical. And I think the time is coming, if it has not already arrived, when employees will appreciate the attitude which has been assumed by the employer, and that by proper management we will experience, in this country at least, not the spread of Bolshevism, not a control by the anarchists, but a fair and just treatment at all times, on the part of employees, when they themselves receive proper treatment. I am of the opinion that employers have no right to disregard for one moment the question of what ought to be done in the treatment of employees, whether or not that disposition is reciprocated. That is good policy; it is good logic and a good principle from the standpoint of business success.

And we assume that the gentlemen who are on this board have this opinion of the proper way to treat labor, for many reasons which occur to them, including the one of right and wrong and also the belief that, if we do not deal justly by labor, the time may come in this country and in other countries, when labor will see to it that it is receiving justice. I say we know that for many reasons, particularly the one to which I have referred, the members of this board are not disposed at this time to place upon the iron and steel industry burdens that they ought not, in justice to themselves and the entire community, to be asked to carry.

[Extracts from address by Elbert H. Gary at annual meeting of the American Bar Association, Boston, Mass., Sept. 4, 1919.]

Judge GARY. The labor question at present is of commanding interest, first because labor is essential to economic growth and virility, and secondly because it is persistently sought by self-appointed leaders to enlist the sympathy and support of workmen in agitation for the substitution of the rule of force for the rule of law and reason. It is commonly designated as "Bolshevism." These agitators will not succeed in the United States. I have heretofore spoken on this subject and will not repeat.

However, it may be observed that the antidote for this poison is plenty of work at reasonable rates of compensation when compared with the cost of living; healthful, safe, and agreeable working conditions; opportunity for workmen to advance in positions according to merit; and a chance to invest their savings in the business with which they are connected. The employers must not and will not give the employees good ground for complaint, and intelligent public sentiment will exercise a controlling influence in preventing a return to barbarism. Employers and employees are under equal responsibility to the general public, of which they are an important part, to assist in maintaining industrial peace and prosperity.

\* \* \* \* \*

Capital and labor both will be fully employed on a basis that will be fair to each and also to all others, and on a scale of returns that will provide an incentive for investment, development, and exertion, and this will insure the largest production at lowest reasonable cost. This will tend to decrease living expenses, increase the comfort and contentment of the people and add to the riches of the Nation, which relies on the prosperity of its citizens for the standing and influence among nations to which it is entitled. There will be no necessity, time, or desire on the part of the vast majority for listening to the vicious doctrines of self-appointed agitators.

[Address by Elbert H. Gary, on Commencement Day, at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., June 23, 1919.]

It is not yet fully realized what has happened to the world during the last five years; and in a much less degree can it be conceived what will occur during the next like period.

We know that in nearly every part of the globe the people are passing through a transitional stage which is uncertain and which presents new and difficult problems of great consequence. It is a time of suspense and apprehension.

We have been living in an atmosphere of disorder and devastation, as opposed to order and preservation; of deliberate, successful effort to utilize all the elements of human knowledge, skill, and energy in the destruction of life and property, often in disregard of the laws of God and man. While it is impossible to measure the full effect of these conditions upon the human mind and disposition, it is apparent that in many cases it is degenerating and serious.

The means of personal communication have reached the point where practically the whole world is promptly informed of the actions and thoughts of the people of the different parts. Consequently the attitude of the inhabitants of one location may have an influence, good or bad, upon those who abide in other places; and therefore the responsibilities of all are now greater than ever before.

We are entering upon an era of readjustment and reconstruction. Many problems of vital interest affecting the future of the human race are presented for consideration as the result of the war, some of them new and others arising from the application of old principles to new conditions; and it is essential that we build on solid foundations for future developments. It is sufficient at this time to say that there is a feeling of anxiety which disturbs the minds of human beings generally; and it is of the highest importance that conclusions shall be reached which will aid in restoring confidence and serenity; decisions based on principles of righteousness and justice. It is probable the feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction, which has been extensively advertised, has been greatly exaggerated, especially as to the numbers affected; nevertheless in other countries to a large extent, and in this country to a less degree, there exists a belief that radical changes in governmental control and administration are necessary. Agitation and propaganda, which are vicious and participated in by those who are totally unworthy, have had some influence even upon well-disposed persons. This is largely because of the abnormal conditions of mind, created by the military cataclysm through which we have been passing during the last four years or more.

It is the solemn duty of every individual, every aggregation of individuals, to assist in bringing about stable conditions which are healthful—morally, socially, and economically; and if this shall be the effort of all it need not be feared there will be experienced the overthrow of civilization, the disregard of freedom and liberty, or the protection of life and property, which occasionally

an ill-advised or evil-intentioned speaker or writer proclaims is now threatening the world.

And there are momentous questions raised even by high-minded individuals which demand our attention. In the discussions of the time, public and private, are contained what is generally designated the labor questions. While some of them are more or less delicate and are difficult in treatment because of misconception of the facts and circumstances in particular instances, still I think there should be frank and full reference to and analysis of the underlying principles which pertain to this subject. The comments which will be made represent views which are entirely personal. In referring to labor one naturally inquires what is meant by the term and whom it includes. In a comprehensive sense labor is performed by nearly everyone in sound condition. Even physical labor is a large part of the daily work of the vast majority of individuals. The rates of compensation do not determine who are laborers, for they differ materially, depending upon circumstances. Labor is not confined to physical activity, but also includes mental exertion. The extent of effort or the hours engaged will not furnish a basis for determination; the possessor of wealth, or the one in control of its use, frequently, if not generally, devotes more hours daily to his business than the lowest paid and least competent of workmen; the capitalist usually works and the hand laborer, to a greater or less extent, not uncommonly has capital.

There is no standard for drawing an exact line between labor and capital. If one will call to mind the different kinds of business and consider carefully and in detail the pertinent facts applicable, these observations will be patent.

In the discussion of this matter, for the moment, the laborer may be referred to as covering both men and women whose principal work is physical, who require no special literary qualifications, or skill derived from long experience, and are often designated as wage earners or workmen. They are the ones who are relied upon by the reckless, iniquitous, self-appointed disturbers of peace to assist in movements to override law and order, for it is assumed they are most easily persuaded.

Fortunately, the large majority of wage earners can not be influenced by considerations that are base or unreasonable. This is especially true in the United States.

It may be useful to bear in mind that in trying to arrive at a wise and just conclusion concerning the rights of the workmen the interests of four general groups must be considered, viz: Labor, capital or employer, the consumer, and that part of the general public not included in the divisions especially mentioned. None of these should be overlooked, each must be fully protected within reason and justice. When something is done to increase or decrease the advantages of one of these groups some or all of the others may be correspondingly concerned, particularly if it involves pecuniary consideration; for instance, if what is proposed relates to the rate of compensation to the workmen, or anything bearing upon the cost of production.

Employer and employee must both be considered at all times and each should be adequately and fairly rewarded for his contribution in money or work to a given enterprise, as otherwise the incentive for investment or effort would be diminished, if not entirely removed. A nation whose economic resources are not utilized to the best advantage and to the full extent of capability can not be expected to progress in accordance with its opportunities in the legitimate attempt to hold its position in the onward stride of nations.

If the return on capital invested is not reasonable it will be withdrawn or diminished, or, at least, extensions will not be made; and in that case employment will be reduced. If the workers are not properly treated then capital will suffer either by the retirement of the workmen or indifference to duty. Each is equally dependent upon the other for the full measure of success. The capitalist can, if necessary, to a limited extent, perform the various tasks pertaining to his business and perhaps thus supply the necessities of life; the laborer, without any capital, resulting from work or otherwise, would find it more difficult to supply his necessities. Each one of these groups, for self-protection, must cultivate the friendship and study the interests of the other.

Assuming that the pecuniary conditions of the capitalist and laborer are established on a basis of justice as between themselves, the next consideration is the relationship between these two combined and the consumer. If the latter could be left out of consideration then there need be no difficulty or difference between employer and employee concerning compensation or other advantages, for whatever was added to the profit of either could be



charged to the consumer by increasing the selling prices of the output. I am not discussing relative prices or amounts; that must always be based, more or less, upon existing conditions, such as those relating to supply and demand, as well as the risks involved, the nature of the employment, the results achieved, etc.

The three groups are intimately connected. Whenever labor receives increases in wages or other pecuniary advantages, the amount must be charged to and paid by the consumer, provided capital is not receiving more than it is entitled to receive. Consequently the question of selling prices or wages in many cases practically relates only to the laborer and the consumer. In estimating the cost of production from the raw to the finished material it should be borne in mind that 85 or 90 per cent of the total is confined to the sum paid for labor. If capital or labor is receiving a larger return than it ought to have the excess is provided by the consumer in paying improper prices. There should always be maintained a fair and reasonable equilibrium, taking into account all the circumstances.

And in discussing the rights of the consumer it must not be overlooked that the capitalists and the laborers are consumers as well as the general public; and therefore that when the capitalist, the laborer, or the general public is seeking any advance in rates or returns which adds to the cost of production or delivery of commodities the one who urges the increase may be proposing to add to selling prices and to the prevailing cost of living. A man may be demanding a supposed benefit to himself when, in fact, the total net result will be a personal disadvantage.

Also, when we consider that the three groups named are closely connected we can not overlook the most important fact that the effort of anyone to advance wages or prices with resulting costs of production, may be simply a step in adding to the cost of living, and consequently a higher standard of general prices with a relatively lower value of the standard dollar.

If we would have a stable, reasonable standard of values, we must, so far as proper and practicable, arrive at and maintain a correct relation between the different groups already particularly referred to. The Government could perhaps endeavor to determine and regulate the respective interests and rights of each, but coupled with the thought there are immediately conceived complicated and doubtful questions which would make the suggestions appear impracticable. When proposals of this character have been made there have appeared objections by both employers and employees. This is not the time or place for debate upon that subject.

We come now directly to the treatment of labor, which is the principal topic of this discourse. In the past it is doubtful if the workman throughout the world received his just deserts. In the long age he was designated the servant of a master and even the laws were framed for the undue benefit of the latter. This was more noticeable in some countries than in others. Possibly the attitude of the so-called servant was sometimes unreasonable and provoked hostility, but, if so, in the opinion of the considerate person of the present day, this furnished no excuse for retaliatory or unfair treatment on the part of the employer.

Fortunately for all mankind, employers and employees as a rule now entertain a more enlightened view of the relationship between them; and because of the practical demonstrations of this fact there is comparatively little likelihood of disturbances inimical to business progress and composure. Agitators, frequently influenced by motives of cupidity, with selfish and unscrupulous designs, regardless of the public good, will bring about temporary disorder, but I firmly believe that if the employers generally in the treatment of their employees are governed by honorable, intelligent and liberal policies there will be no considerable danger of disregard of law or of interference with the orderly progress of human enterprise. Wise, just, considerate treatment by an individual or an aggregation of individuals, toward others will result in reciprocity and cooperation. Accomplishment by force in any form must give way to reason and conciliation. This is not idealistic; it is practical common sense. The Golden Rule, more and more, should and will be practised in every day economic life.

In considering the relationship between employers and employees the welfare of the latter is of the highest importance, not alone because it is right, though that is reason enough, but also because it is for the benefit of the employers themselves. These groups are associated for mutual profit. They succeed or fail together. Each has obligations and responsibilities. They are not and

should not be considered partners in the sense of being entitled to the control of the business in question or to participate in the return on the capital invested, except to the extent of contribution by each to such capital, for otherwise one would share in benefits without sharing in the hazard of investment. Prospective profits furnish the incentive to embark in enterprise and to risk capital. To the extent this is removed or hampered to a corresponding degree will capital be withheld or diverted and economic activity diminished.

But there are many things the employee is justly entitled to. There is due him fair and reasonable compensation, depending upon all the circumstances surrounding the employment. The times, places, services and results of operation are important to be considered. Necessarily and properly, the question of supply and demand is, and always will be a factor in determining prices of labor, as it is in dealing with commodities. This is elementary and healthy; but there are other things of equal importance. When there is a well-grounded doubt in regard to wage rates it should be resolved in favor of the employee.

Of equal consequence is the safety and health—moral, mental, and physical—of the employee, and, so far as practical, him family, if he has any. Safety appliances—the best and most modern—should be installed and maintained in every line of employment which presents dangers to the person. Medical, surgical, and hospital facilities should be adequate. Sanitary arrangements should be as near perfect as business conditions permit. Approved systems for voluntary relief in case of accident and pensions in case of old age or other disability should be in force.

Habitable working quarters and homes, vegetable and flower gardens, schools, churches, parks, wholesome amusements and exercises should be provided; and, in fact, everything practicable in the management of business affairs, from the highest sense of propriety and obligation should be available. In times of great temporary stress the employee or his family ought not to be permitted to suffer for lack of the necessities of life. It pays big, in dollars and cents, for the employer to maintain working conditions which are beneficial to the health and the disposition of the employee.

While it is not the purpose of this address to discuss the temperance question, I venture to remark in passing, that it is decidedly for the interest of the laboring men, and all others for that matter, whether they work with their brains or hands, or both, to abstain from the use of alcoholic stimulants. They will be more successful in life, financially and otherwise; better citizens, morally and mentally; of higher standing and greater influence; more contented and happier. Temperance means fewer hospitals, almshouses, and prisons; less suffering and misery.

The workmen ought in some form to be offered opportunity to invest on favorable terms in the business inaugurated by the employer. This encourages thoughtful attention and endeavor to economize and save. It makes the wage earner an actual partner in the business of the concern with which he is associated—a real capitalist. Many of the wage earners have heretofore become property owners, owning the houses in which, with their families, they reside. Some are the holders of interest bearing securities. The number of this character of investors is increasing. They have as keen a desire to see the institutions of this country protected as those who have greater riches, and they may be relied upon to lend their influence and their votes in favor of the protection of property and person. Opportunity must be given to the workmen to increase their pecuniary holdings so far as practicable. To this end I believe the employers will do their part.

Every employee should have the chance to progress from one position to another, depending upon his merits. The average workman does not wish to remain in the lower grades of employment or to bring to this level others filling better positions. He desires full and fair opportunity to occupy higher and still higher places, based on efficiency and faithfulness. This he is entitled to and it must be accorded him.

Whenever we find the families of manufacturing workmen living in clean houses, surrounded by beautiful and thrifty gardens, together with the privileges of good schools and satisfactory churches, we may be certain the shop and mills are well managed and maintained in good order. What is here advocated applies more particularly to large manufacturing concerns; but the idea should extend to every line of employment. A cheerful, contented workman is a consolation and a valuable asset to the employer and to the State. He is essential to continuous prosperity. It is the recognized duty of the employer of to-

day, as it is his pleasure, generally speaking, at least, to do his part in securing this kind of labor.

We may not expect perfection in economic enterprise and management; perhaps we shall not see universal, uninterrupted tranquillity, even in this highly civilized, progressive and prosperous country; but we shall not witness demoralization, revolution or retrogradation.

Those who claim that large numbers of workmen in this country could be induced to participate in any attempt to override law or order misjudge and underrate them. The great majority are opposed; and of this majority there are in control the young men and the young women; the pride and the security of the nation.

During the recent stupendous military conflict there were in the employ of one large corporation and its subsidiaries about 300,000 wage earners.

The greater part were foreign born; thousands upon thousands of them from the central countries of Europe. They were appreciative of the disposition of their employers to treat them justly and in accordance with high standards of business principles. They were efficient, faithful, and loyal. The manufacturing works were maintained in continuous operation throughout the war, and supplied a large and important part of the material needed for the military necessities of the United States and its associates. These workers subscribed liberally to the Liberty Loans and many of them contributed to the war relief campaigns. Here was a magnificent exhibition of reciprocal sentiment and industrial cooperation. It was a demonstration that labor in this country is intelligent and honest in thought and performance; and that it may be depended upon to actively assist in the maintenance of good government.

The labor question at present is engrossing the attention of students and will continue to do so with predominant importance after the conferences at Paris are concluded. The workmen have been credited with worthy achievement or charged with lawless and destructive tendencies, perhaps in both respects in unjustified measure.

The final attitude of the large majority, certainly in the United States, will be right. Their own welfare will be thus promoted.

But public sentiment, based on facts, developed particularly by the learned, thoughtful, fair-minded, and conscientious men and women who are neither capitalists nor laborers in the sense intended by what has been said, will have, in the future, more influence upon the situation than ever before; and the attitude of the employers toward employees, if it shall be such as I have indicated it ought to be, will be a potent factor for good.

In the front ranks of great and good and successful men and women will be seen the college graduates. Much depends upon them; and they will measure up to their obligations and opportunities.

STATEMENTS FROM ADDRESSES BY AND INTERVIEW WITH ELBERT H. GARY, CHAIRMAN UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION, FROM 1904 TO 1912.

[Extract from interview given to the public press in 1904.]

The elimination of wasteful strife in industry and commerce will enable employers to pay better wages, and as the productive energies of the Nation become more ordered and more perfectly adjusted to the markets of the world the relations of capital and labor will settle themselves on sensible and mutually profitable lines.

Speaking for the greatest corporation in the world I can say that in spite of the thousand questions of economical production and distribution which press upon us, our first concern is the welfare of our workmen. I can say that honestly. Never for a moment do we lose sight of the interests of the men who work in our steel mills, mines, railways, or boats. We have more than once voluntarily advanced wages. It is to our interest to be just to our employees. No one understands that better than the men who are charged with the responsibility of carrying on this immense business. We employ 166,163 men and pay \$120,727,241 annually in wages. We want to pay our men well because it is necessary to have the best labor obtainable.

And this plan of industry on a large scale not only brings better wages and greater opportunities to our workmen, but it is raising the standard of American labor; it is training men to work with the best tools in the best methods, in the best conditions.

As for the workmen of the country, in my opinion, there are good times and good conditions in prospect for them. As the industries of America are ordered

and the true value and necessities of the employees are fully understood, it will be to the interest of the employers to stimulate good work by good wages. It is good work as well as good methods that is to give us our leadership in the markets. No man and no corporation has a right to ignore the interest of his or its employees. I do not know whether the public will believe it, but a great deal of our time and thought in this corporation is devoted to a careful and humane study of the question of wages and hours of work. The welfare of our men can never be lost sight of, no matter what happens. It is not only right that they should share in our prosperity, but it is good business policy; it is an integral part of the plan of concentrated, improved industry. We never forget that the foundations of our business rest on human beings, and we are human beings ourselves.

[Extract from address at meeting of American Iron and Steel Institute, New York, Oct. 14, 1910.]

Again, there is not better way of advancing our own interests than to conduct ourselves in such a way as to make it certain we are endeavoring to promote the welfare of others with whom we come in contact. Uppermost in our minds should be the proper consideration of the rights of our employees. Members of this institute represent corporations or firms who have in their employ hundreds of thousands of men. Many of these workmen are foreigners who are not familiar with our language or customs. Some of them have been poor and have had few advantages in their native countries, and may not be fully able to protect themselves.

Whether this be true or not we should make it certain that all are so treated that they have the opportunity to be well housed, and should make it certain that all are so treated that they have the opportunity to be well housed, and well fed, and well clothed. So far as we can we should lend our assistance to the improvement of the conditions of our workmen; and, of course, the wages paid should always be fair and reasonable. All of us have discovered since this institute was formed that there were many things which we could do for the betterment of the conditions of the workmen; and we have been prompt to do them. Particularly have we made great strides toward safeguarding our employees against accidental injury. A continuation of the efforts we have been making in this direction will result in securing a larger measure of confidence on their part, and will bring to us the consciousness that not only have we benefited ourselves pecuniarily, but what is more important, that we have done the right thing.

[Extracts from remarks made at dinner given to the iron and steel manufacturers, Jan. 11, 1911.]

One thing is certain, if we reduce prices in view of the high cost of production at the present time, and the low prices of our products, which are very much lower than they were in 1907, we can not, with very slight exceptions, reduce prices unless we reduce the wages we are paying for labor, and that, I think, would be deplored. I think we should all the time have in mind the best interests of our employees, no matter whether they treat us right or wrong, and regardless of what they may have done in the past. We have the advantage of them in education, in experience, in wealth, in many ways, and we must make it absolutely certain under all circumstances that we treat them right. [Applause.]

You know what has been the attitude of the members of the institute on this subject. Many of you remember the most excellent address of Mr. Dickson before the members of the institute, and you know many circumstances tending to show our friendly attitude toward labor. We must not take a backward step in this matter. We may be forced to reduce wages anyhow, for maybe they are too high at present, but you gentlemen will have to satisfy me with facts and figures before you get my consent to any reduction. I would like to maintain them if we can, but to do that we must have fair and reasonable prices for our product.

[Extract from remarks made at dinner given to the iron and steel manufacturers, May 4, 1911.]

Coming to this question of welfare work, I think one of the most important questions which the American Iron and Steel Institute has to consider is the question of the proper treatment of employees. It is not important to consider what the treatment of the employer of the employee is or may be. The man

who has the intelligence and the success and the capital to employ labor has placed upon himself voluntarily a responsibility with reference to his men which he can not escape and ought not to endeavor to escape. And I want to say to you, gentlemen, in my opinion one of the greatest questions for consideration by the capitalists of America to-day is the question of the treatment of their employees—of the laboring men, so as to make it certain there will never in this country be any excuse for the advancement of the ideas of the anarchist or the socialist. If those who represent capital, those who represent power, those who have the opportunity to make better or worse the condition of the laboring men, will make it absolutely certain that the right thing is done under all circumstances, and that no excuse is offered for attack on the part of those who are employed, they will be doing something for their country that is worth while. And the American Iron and Steel Institute, through and by the efforts of this general standing committee, has undertaken to do a work which, in my opinion, will be of the greatest benefit, not only to the institute itself, but to the country at large.

[Extract from remarks made at a luncheon given to the iron and steel manufacturers, May 29, 1911.]

I have urged you to remember and I call attention to the fact that when you made substantial reductions in your prices, if you reduce to a price that is unfair and unreasonable, and you make so small a profit that it does not yield you a fair return on your investment and your risk, you, at least, place for consideration before everyone the possible necessity of reducing the cost of production, including prominently, if not principally, the wages which you are paying, or may be allowed to pay, to the man or the men in your employ. Do not forget that the laboring men—the employees of the corporations—have more at risk, when these questions are considered of reducing prices below what is reasonable and fair, than the employer, because it is just as natural as it is right and fair that if reasonable profits are prevented and your prices are put down below what they ought to be then, as a matter of necessity, you are forced to consider and perhaps decide in favor of a liquidation of the wages of your employees; and you have no right to disregard them and their interests. You have no right to run the risk of being compelled to put their wages below what they ought to be unless you are driven to it, and I hope, under the present circumstances, gentlemen, that whatever may be done, or whatever may happen as a result of present conditions, you will not reduce the wages of your employees until you feel it is an absolute necessity to do so.

We should undertake to place ourselves on a plane much higher than the demagogue or the reformer who attempts to assail us and who pretends to be the champion of the laboring man. We do not need any suggestion from people like that. We know what our duty is, we know what the rights of our employees are, and we feel obligated, and take pleasure in knowing that we are at all times doing all we can for the people in our employ in keeping their wages up and in bettering their condition and keeping them in a position where they may enjoy life. We are the ones to lead in this movement. So, gentlemen, I bring this up because I have read in some of the newspapers that there will undoubtedly soon be a reduction in wages—and we may be forced to it. I shall regret if we are—but, gentlemen, let us not come to the conclusion of reducing wages until we are compelled to do so. Let us keep them as high as we can just as long as we can.

[Extract from remarks at meeting of the presidents of the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation, Oct. 19, 1911.]

I hope also that you will take special pains to conciliate and promote the best interests of your employees. I consider this of the highest importance. I think we have little, if any, labor in our manufacturing plants at the present time which is not what we call "open shop," and I am very glad that your employees are pleased with that fact. Of course, we understand generally the rank and file, the large majority of the laboring men, do not wish to become or remain members of unions; that they are influenced by the leaders, so-called; that they join unions very frequently because the employer deals with unions as such, and therefore the men cannot get employment except by joining the unions.

But, nevertheless, this subject is one which is in the public mind all the time; it is discussed, and very frequently unfairly discussed, by agitators; and there is a large percentage of the public not fully advised who believe that unions

should be contracted with; and therefore employers of labor, such as you, are more or less in the public eye with respect to this question. I am not dealing with individual cases now; I am expressing no opinion with reference to them. I am only dealing with the subject in a general way; but I would like to urge and emphasize certain things. Make it certain all the time that the men in your employ are treated as well, if not a little better, than other men who are working for people who deal and contract with unions; make it certain you pay as liberal wages; that your hours are as good; that your facilities are as great; that your men are as comfortably housed where you have anything to do with the subject; that those who may buy from your stores, where you have any, purchase at as low a price or lower prices than they could buy elsewhere; that the sanitation is as good at your works as at any other place; that so far as you have control and influence your men are as comfortable in every respect as the men in any other place; and, so far as you can, cultivate a feeling of friendship, and influence your men to the conclusion that it is for their interests in every respect to be in your employ. I do not say this, gentlemen, merely from a standpoint of policy, although it is good policy to do everything which I have suggested. But here again you are just as much interested in the questions as anybody else; it is not necessary to read in magazines or periodicals recommendations that you improve the conditions of your men; you are a part of the public; you are interested as loyal citizens in these great ethical and sociological questions; you are making a record not alone for your stockholders but for yourselves.

It is going to be said of some time in the future, you occupied high positions and you measured up to them, and you did your duty not only as representatives of large financial interests but as public citizens. And I urge this upon you as being a part of the policy of our great aggregation of men. It is more important all the time that we do the right thing concerning all the interests in our charge than it is that we make a good deal of money. We may be conducting our affairs without any future prospect of being allowed even to live. I do not believe that is the fact; I believe in the last analysis, the policies and principles which we have stood for will be properly recognized and that we shall be allowed to go on in our work to greater success. Whether this is true or not is of little importance, comparatively speaking; we must make it certain we are doing the right thing.

[Extract from address as president to members American Iron and Steel Institute at annual meeting, May 17, 1912.]

During the year we have established and maintained a department of welfare work which has been under the immediate direction, so far as the institute is concerned, of Dr. Darlington, who is the representative of a committee on welfare, made up of seven members of the board of directors. This committee has been making very substantial progress in the direction of bettering the conditions of the working men. I quote from the secretary on this subject:

"Already the 7-day week has been practically eliminated in all the larger plants of the iron and steel industry, even in the continuous operations where it had been regarded as unavoidable. Much thought has been given to the question of hours of labor and better conditions are being gradually worked out. The prevention of accidents has been investigated and safety devices costing vast sums of money, but worth all they cost in preventing human suffering, have been installed. A beginning has been made in building up a museum of safety devices, where the best things of the kind known in the world can be seen and studied by members of the institute. In more and more of the companies, sanitary officers are being appointed, and the health of employees is having more consideration than ever before. Hundreds of thousands of health circulars have been sent out by the institute. A monthly publication to serve as a medium of communication with its members has been authorized by the directors, and the near future will see the beginning of its publication."

As you know, your president a long time since at one of our meetings took a decided stand with respect to what should be the attitude of employers of labor toward the employees. And I am glad to say that the directors of the institute, and other members of the institute, and the employers of labor generally who are connected with this industry, have fully supported all that has been said and every action that has been taken in favor of establishing and maintaining a position and a comprehensive work which is calculated to promote the welfare of the working men.

It is true that we sometimes read in the newspapers criticisms which are unfavorable but which misrepresent the facts. As a rule the newspapers are fair and considerate and mean to publish the truth and to do the right thing; but like all others who are compelled to rely upon information which is gathered from various sources, they are frequently imposed upon and do an injustice to those who are affected, without intending to do so. We have been fortunate in having connected with our efforts editors of the principal trade journals, who have always been fair and accurate in their statements. Nevertheless, at times, by reason of misrepresentation made to some of the other newspapers, or as a result of public addresses by men who are careless of their statements or by those who are not inclined to be accurate, and whose efforts seem to have been to excite a prejudice on the part of employees, some of the leading employers in the steel industry have been accused of ill treatment to their workmen. But I make the assertion, gentlemen, that in no line of industry, at any period in the history of the world in any country, was labor on the whole better treated in every respect than it is at the present time by the employers of labor in this great line of industrial activity. [Applause.]

I congratulate you, gentlemen, that you have generally recognized your obligations, and that you have measured up to your responsibility, not because it has paid you in dollars and cents, but more especially because in recognizing the spirit of cooperation, the feeling of fraternity, the feeling of affectionate regard which men occupying high positions are beginning to realize they must entertain in order to get the best results in life, you have from the abundance of the heart taken a position concerning these questions which is sound and just.

As has been said by some of our speakers at our banquets, we must all the time make it certain that those who happen to be under our control or subjected to our influence, and who are not sufficiently able to care for their own interests, shall be protected by us to the fullest extent. And I hope and predict that this institute will never occupy a position concerning this question which can be justly criticised.

#### SAFETY, SANITATION, AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION.

For years the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation endeavored, each in its own way, to reduce the number of accidents to its employees. In 1906 the corporation itself entered the field in order to secure the maximum results by affording a means of systematizing and standardizing the work of the subsidiaries. In May of that year the corporation called a meeting of the casualty managers of all the subsidiary companies for the purpose of discussing ways and means for preventing accidents to employees. This committee of casualty managers met from time to time, and at a meeting in April, 1908, held for the purpose of considering the results of the attempts which had already been made to prevent accidents and of considering and formulating plans for the prevention of accidents and safeguarding employees, a committee on safety was appointed.

*Committee on safety.*—Originally this committee was composed of six members—an officer of the Steel Corporation, acting as chairman, and five other members, each representing one of the subsidiary companies. Later four members were added, giving representation on the committee to nine of the subsidiary companies. The meetings of the committee are held four times a year, either in New York or at one of the plants or mines. The committee conducts inspections by sending an inspector from one company to go over another company's operations. It makes careful study of all serious accidents and recommends methods to prevent their recurrence in any department of the industry. It passes upon safety devices and recommends their use.

*Committee on sanitation.*—This committee is composed of five members, four of whom are president of subsidiary companies and the fifth an official of the corporation. In addition, there is a subcommittee on sanitation, made up of representatives, one from each of the larger companies. The functions of the sanitation committee are similar to those of the safety committee. It passes upon sanitary devices and regulation, directs inspections, and employs sanitary engineers to make inspection in order to secure the best judgment on the particular problem in hand.

*Central safety committee.*—This committee is composed of important officials from each of the plants, mines, or railroad divisions. It meets monthly and its duties are similar to the Steel Corporation safety committee, but each with reference to its particular company. It conducts intermill inspections. In

companies where there is no organization on sanitation the duties of the various safety committees have been extended to cover this work.

*The plant safety committee.*—This committee is made up of important officials from the plant; it meets monthly or weekly, and in some cases daily; makes inspections of the plant at regular intervals. Its duties are similar to the central safety committee, but with reference to its own particular plant.

*Workmen's safety committee.*—This committee usually consists of three members from the rank and file of the mill. It meets monthly; in some cases weekly; makes regular inspections of the plant or departments; investigates accidents that have happened, and recommends means of preventing similar accidents. Its members are changed periodically so that each man in the plant shall serve upon the committee.

*Department and special committees.*—This committee is composed of foremen, master mechanics, and skilled workmen. It meets weekly or monthly, as planned, makes periodical inspections of the plant and conducts special investigations of particular problems.

Up to the present time more than 22,000 employees have served upon these committees. There are now more than 5,000 men so serving.

#### BUREAU OF SAFETY, SANITATION, AND WELFARE.

The success of the work undertaken by the various committees heretofore outlined resulted in a great increase in the scope of the work and its usefulness. This necessitated the organization of a central station to assist the efforts of the committees and all other efforts which were being made among the subsidiary companies to improve the conditions of their employees.

Accordingly in March, 1911, the bureau of safety, sanitation, and welfare was organized. This bureau is in charge of a manager, whose entire time is given to the work of obtaining information and disseminating it among the subsidiary companies. The bureau also carries on the administration work of both the committee on safety and the committee on sanitation.

It distributes to the subsidiary companies comparative statements on accident prevention compiled from reports submitted by the companies periodically, thus enabling each company to benefit by the experience of all the others. The bureau is constantly in communication with municipal, State, and national authorities, with other employers of labor, and with many other persons engaged or interested in this work. From many sources it obtains valuable information on these subjects and keeps the subsidiary companies informed of the latest and best methods of accident prevention and welfare work. It was realized from the beginning that cooperation between those carrying on this work is a valuable feature.

While the bureau was installed primarily for the benefit of the subsidiary companies of the corporation, many other employers of labor have written for information or have visited the bureau. Scarcely a day passes without a call from some individual or committee interested in the welfare work of some company or corporation for the purpose of securing information regarding the general plan or specific details of its work.

#### ACCIDENT PREVENTION.

The results of the work on accident prevention have been very gratifying. Our serious and fatal accidents are about one-half of what they were in 1906. Since that time 22,909 men have been saved from serious or fatal injury. (See chart.) Approximately \$3,000,000 have been spent in providing safeguards.

#### FIRST AID AND RESCUE.

Recognizing the fact that with the utmost care and the protection afforded by the most approved safety devices and apparatus, accidents will occasionally happen, the subsidiary companies have made provision for prompt attention to injured men and skillful care of them.

All the mining companies of the corporation have first aid and rescue crews composed of employees who are especially trained for the work. This service is purely voluntary on the part of the employees, but before any man is allowed to enter the work, he must have a doctor's certificate showing he is physically fit for the training and labor incidental to it. The system varies slightly in each company, but the general plan is as follows: Four to six men



are assigned to each crew. They meet periodically and are trained by the company doctor. The course consists of lectures, demonstrations, and drills. Twelve lessons are usually required to complete the course, and each man is given a certificate after he has qualified. The training of the men for the work goes on continually and many crews are added each year. A number of crews are assigned to each mine.

At many of the manufacturing plants of the subsidiary companies of the corporation men are trained in first-aid work. The training is similar to that given in the mining companies. The primary object of first aid is to furnish an aseptic or clean dressing that will prevent infection of the wound.

#### EMERGENCY AND BASE HOSPITALS.

As a necessary adjunct to first aid and rescue work in both mines and mills, emergency hospitals, completely equipped, have been provided. All cases of injury, no matter how trivial, are sent to the emergency hospitals, or stations, where treatment is given by competent surgeons or trained nurses. Whenever the accident is of a serious nature, the injured man is taken to the emergency station, where first-aid treatment is administered, and he is then transferred to the nearest hospital. Public hospitals are used in most cases, although base hospitals have been constructed by the subsidiary companies at a number of points.

The base hospital now being built by the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co. for the benefit of its employees is situated on Flint Ridge, a wooded hill overlooking the town of Fairfield. This location is central to the various operations of the company in the Birmingham district, and is ideal in every way—the elevation and drainage are good, the grounds are ample and well wooded, and there are street car lines within easy access.

The hospital is a three-story and English basement building of cut limestone, brick, terra cotta and reinforced concrete construction. The design of the building is such that every part can be well lighted, and the maximum of window space is provided.

Absolutely fireproof construction has been adopted throughout. All floors are terrazzo and the window frames are of steel. In fact, with the exception of a few interior doors, no wood has been used in the building.

A separate power house accommodates boilers, under which by-product gas will be burned—and Turbo generators for emergency electric power, water and fire pumps, ice machinery, etc. Air treatment and washing machinery with air fans, both force and suction, as well as ample air ducts to every part of the building, are provided.

The building will accommodate a maximum of 348 patients. There are 30 rooms for the handling of cases of communicable diseases and 25 for patients desiring private rooms. The balance of the space is in wards of 15 to 20 beds capacity.

A well-equipped laundry is provided in the basement; the kitchens are in the rear of the central building on the main floor, the X-ray and laboratory sections on the second floor, and the dressing and operating rooms on the third floor.

Three automatic elevators have been installed, all with access to the roof, which will be utilized to the fullest extent for open air and sunlight treatment.

Construction work was begun late in December, 1917, but owing to various delays incident to the war, the building was not ready for occupation until this fall. The cost of the hospital was over \$1,000,000.

#### BELIEF.

Also recognizing the fact that the burden of caring for the injured should be borne by the industry, the Steel Corporation established a voluntary accident relief plan, which was put into force before any such system had become law in the United States. This plan is purely voluntary and was put into operation by the corporation in May, 1910, and is for the benefit of all employees injured and the families of employees killed in the service of the subsidiary companies. The funds required to carry out the plan are provided by the companies, with no contribution whatever from the employees. Relief is paid regardless of legal liability and without legal proceedings; even application for relief is not required. This plan of relief is still in effect in these States where workmen's compensation laws have not been enacted. The amount paid in 1918, to and for our injured workmen, including expenditures both under our plan and work-

men's compensation laws, was \$2,919,226, or 87 per cent of our total expenditures, account of work accidents, was paid out to the injured men and their families or in taking care of them. The cost of maintaining company hospitals and emergency rooms in 1918 was \$1,062,374, while the amount paid to public hospitals, outside surgeons, specialists, etc., was \$329,292.

#### SANITATION.

In sanitation many improvements have been made in the proper investigation and observation of water supply and distribution to the employees. All sources of drinking water are analyzed periodically and great care is taken to prevent possible pollution by surface water or otherwise. The most modern sanitary methods are employed in the cooling and distributing of the water, including the installation of sanitary drinking fountains; the common drinking cup has been practically eliminated.

Three hundred and fifty-five piped systems for drinking water have been installed, as also 2,835 sanitary drinking-water fountains; 597 wells and springs have been protected against pollution. The cost of providing good drinking water to employees last year was \$507,732.

The common or roller towel was abolished several years ago. The committee has prepared specifications covering general sanitary requirements, and these are followed by the subsidiary companies when installations are made. An important requirement in these specifications is that no wash basins shall be installed. Facilities for washing the face and hands shall be such that employees must necessarily wash from the flowing stream. This was done to eliminate one possible danger of spreading disease. Good toilet facilities have been installed at practically all the plants and mines, these facilities usually including shower baths. A total of 1,390 comfort stations have been provided—the equipment includes 6,837 water-closet bowls, 2,329 urinals, 16,479 washing faucets and basins, 2,446 showers, and 110,759 lockers. Much has been done at the plants and mines to remove dust and provide good ventilation.

Alabama, where one of our mining companies conducts its operations, the natural conditions are favorable to mosquito breeding. The Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co. especially are doing much to prevent the spread of malaria fever. Streets and alleys are properly drained; pools and lowlands are drained or filled in, where practical; otherwise they are covered with crude petroleum. All known methods of fighting the mosquito are used. By these methods the number of cases of malaria fever has been greatly reduced, and the comfort of the people living in the towns has been increased. The malaria fever cases have been reduced from a normal 6,000 cases a year to less than 50 cases this year.

The total cost of the work in 1918 coming under the head of sanitation was \$3,145,174.

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES—GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SANITARY INSTALLATIONS, PREPARED BY THE SANITATION COMMITTEE JULY, 1916.

Sanitation committee: George G. Crawford, chairman; Raynal C. Bolling, William B. Schiller, W. J. Olcott, C. L. Close, secretary.

Subcommittee on sanitation: C. L. Close, chairman; E. C. Brown, H. T. Porter, W. J. Olcott, Thomas Ewing, C. L. Farson, John M. Davidson, Dr. Lloyd Noland, Marshall Williams, R. W. Campbell, H. A. Schultz.

The information presented in this book has been prepared under the direction of the sanitation committee of the United States Steel Corporation, as a result of the experience of the subsidiary companies and this committee in matters pertaining to sanitation. It is to be used as a guide in standardizing sanitary equipment and aims to insure the provision of efficient sanitary facilities and proper sanitary conditions at the time construction work is planned; also it is the intention that the present equipment shall be made to conform to these suggestions, in so far as practicable, whenever replacements and repairs are required.

It is recommended that each company prepare and adopt its own detail specifications and standard design of equipment conforming with these general requirements.

The principles of sanitary design and requirements for substantial construction embodied herein do not necessarily involve expensive or elaborate details.

Such construction is entirely out of place in installations for mill buildings, shops, and yards, and should be avoided.

All legal requirements, such as local building codes, city ordinances, plumbing regulations, etc., should be observed, and if there is any direct conflict between these requirements and such legislation, the latter should, of course, control.

The requirements approved by the sanitation committee of the United States Steel Corporation in 1914 are printed in *italics*; the interpolations in heavy type are explanatory.

#### SECTION I.—WATER-CLOSETS.

##### A. Location:

1. Closets should be located as conveniently as possible to work.

While due regard should be given to convenience of location to avoid loss of time, employees should not be unnecessarily exposed to weather conditions or accident hazards en route.

2. There should be a number of small installations rather than a few large ones.

This is recommended so that available space in mill buildings may be utilized. If closets are conveniently located there will be less time lost and employees will be relieved promptly, which promotes good physical condition.

3. Each toilet room should be so located as to open to outside light and air.

The committee does not approve of installations removed from outside light and air, but realizes that under certain conditions, due to congestion, it would be impossible to comply with this requirement. In confined situations, where side windows would not give sufficient light and ventilation, roof lighting and roof ventilating may be preferable. Where closets must be installed with little or no light and ventilation from either side windows or roof, effective artificial lighting and forced draft ventilation should be provided. Wherever possible roof ventilation should be provided for all installations.

##### B.—Construction of building:

4. The minimum amount of window space for a toilet room, containing one fixture must be 4 square feet; and for each additional fixture an addition of 2 square feet of window space must be made. These windows must be so constructed that they can be opened to give adequate ventilation to the room.

5. Each toilet room should have not less than 10 square feet of floor space and not less than 100 cubic feet of air space for each fixture installed.

##### C.—Interior finish of building:

6. Walls should be of nonabsorbent material with a smooth surface, not only to facilitate cleaning, but to avoid defacement. They should have cove corners. (Explanation as noted under 7 applies to walls.)

7. Floors should be constructed of tile or concrete, with a smooth surface. The material should be nonabsorbent.

Concrete or cement with smooth, hard surface are considered satisfactory materials, except for special installations, where a more elaborate finish may be desired. The materials may be made nonabsorbent by proper care in construction of mixtures and the use of compounds applied to the concrete after it has been laid.

8. Closets should be separate from locker and wash rooms by partitions or other means.

To secure privacy and to produce the best sanitary conditions in wash and locker rooms where employees leave their personal belongings while they are at work.

9. Walls and partitions preferably should be of light color to increase illumination and to facilitate cleaning.

10. Toilets should be adequately heated in cold weather.

11. Heating facilities should be arranged to permit proper cleaning of floors and walls.

12. Hose connection should be provided.

To facilitate cleaning by providing means to thoroughly flush and scrub room and equipment.

##### D.—Number of fixtures:

13. Number of seats should be not less than 1 to every 15 persons, based upon the maximum number of employees in a turn in departments using the unit.

14. An adequate number of urinals should be provided in each closet room.

It will be noted under requirement "32 — urinals" that separate urinals are to be installed at convenient places throughout mill buildings. Where this

is done at least one urinal should be installed in each closet room to discourage the insanitary practice of using closets as urinals.

15. Unless wash rooms are in close proximity to closet, each closet room should be supplied with at least one washing faucet.

The installation of a washing faucet in a closet room, not in close proximity to a wash room, is to promote personal cleanliness by encouraging the men to wash after using these facilities.

E.—Character of fixtures:

16. Closets should be of individual bowl type with individual water seal, and should be made of porcelain or vitreous china, and not of enameled iron.

Flush range closets, used more or less extensively before the organization of the sanitation committee, are considered insanitary and similar to an open sewer. Enameled iron, of which the ranges are most commonly made, soon corrodes, leaving the equipment in a deplorable condition, and flushing feces under others using the range, is insanitary, disagreeable, and objectionable. Individual closets made of porcelain or vitreous china overcome the objectionable features and provide a sanitary, durable, neat-appearing bowl, which can be thoroughly cleaned.

17. The seat of each water-closet should be made of wood or other nonheat absorbing material, coated with varnish or other finish which will make it impervious to water. Under no circumstances should the use of seats made of enameled ironware, porcelain, or other similar heat absorbing material be allowed.

The use of nonheat absorbing material for seats eliminates any harmful effects which might come from men sitting on a cold surface.

18. The size of the opening should be at least 7 inches in width and 11 inches in length.

This size is recommended to insure the maintenance of a clean seat.

There should be partitions between the seats, preferably of steel construction, painted or enameled, 6 feet in height and 12 inches off the floor.

An employee is entitled to a certain amount of privacy.

20. Distance between partitions should not be less than 30 inches and distance from front of seat to door not less than 30 inches.

These dimensions are considered ample to permit of a man using the equipment comfortably.

21. Partitions and bowls should be so arranged that entire space behind and below the seat can be easily cleaned.

22. Doors should be not less than 20 inches in height. If of this dimension, the lower part of the door should be placed 24 inches above the floor.

This door is provided for privacy. It should be equipped with spring hinges, and open outward or swing.

23. Clothes hooks should be provided.

24. Toilet paper with proper holders should be provided by the company.

If toilet paper is provided there is less danger that sewers will be clogged with material such as waste, newspapers, etc., carried into the water-closet by workmen.

25. Regular and thorough cleaning should be instituted; reliance upon disinfectant is not sufficient.

This refers to disinfectants or deodorizers used in drip cans or sprinkled on the floor. Thorough scrubbing with soap and water is the most efficient method of cleansing. The use of a germicide following scrubbing is not objected to.

26. A special attendant should be appointed.

This means a man who devotes sufficient time to keeping the sanitary installations clean and in good order. Large installations may require the entire time of an attendant, but one man can probably take care of several small installations.

The mere providing of sanitary equipment is not sufficient; it should be maintained in a manner to make it attractive and inviting.

#### SECTION II—CONSTRUCTION OF CLOSETS WHERE THERE IS NO SEWERAGE SYSTEM.

F. Requirements:

27. There should be sufficient light.

There should be sufficient light in the closet to insure cleanliness, but the vault or other receptacle, provided for feces, should be protected as thoroughly as possible against the entrance of flies and other germ-carrying insects. The building should be provided with tight-fitting doors, opening inward, and

equipped with spring hinges, so that the normal position would be closed. Windows and ventilators should be screened.

28. There should be proper ventilation.

This should include both vault and room ventilation.

29. The hole in the seat should be at least 7 inches in width and 11 inches in length.

This size is recommended to secure the maintenance of a clean seat.

30. For each hole there should be a close-fitting cover.

Persons using the closet should be encouraged to keep the seat covered to prevent flies and other germ-carrying insects coming in contact with the feces.

31. All privies should have provisions for cleaning.

This refers to the removal of feces, and the necessary arrangements should be considered when the closets are built.

#### SECTION III.—URINALS.

##### G. Requirements:

32. An adequate number of separate urinals should be placed throughout the mill convenient to place where men work.

This will avoid loss of time required for a man to walk some distance to relieve himself.

33. Troughs and basins should not be used for urinals. The wall or vertical-slab urinal with proper finishing should be used, preferably the porcelain stall.

The design and use of plant-made urinals for general mill purposes is encouraged, provided nonabsorbent and noncorrosive material is used. Concrete is satisfactory if well made and the correct mixtures used to give nonabsorbing qualities. All perforated flush pipes for flat panel urinals should be designed to avoid stoppage by rust or sediment and so arranged that the water can not flow or drip without washing the entire face of the panel. Where continuous flushing is not practicable, the periodic flush tanks should operate at such intervals as to keep the entire panel wet, clean, and free from odor.

34. There should be protection around the urinals to secure privacy.

There should be a suitable inclosure around the separate fixture to insure privacy, but not of such character that sufficient light for inspection and thorough cleaning and ventilation is prevented.

35. Floor in front of urinal should slope to drain.

The floor in front of urinal should, in every case, be of smooth nonabsorbent material, sloped toward the drain, and should preferably be constructed as a narrow standing raised about 3 inches above the floor. The raised floor will insure the proper position of the person using the urinal.

#### SECTION IV.—WASH AND LOCKER ROOMS.

##### H. Location:

36. Wash rooms should be located in places most convenient to the men to be served; if possible along route when going from work and without exposure to the weather.

37. So far as possible they should be located in places where the men are least exposed to accident while en route, such as crossing railroad tracks, roll trains, and other dangerous places.

38. They should preferably be located in a separate building, or if within a building, they should be inclosed.

Men should be encouraged to wash and change their clothing before leaving the plant. An inclosure for the washing facilities, located within a mill building, is recommended, so that street apparel will not be exposed to the dirt from the mill. Wash rooms should be in the same building as the locker room, to obviate the inconvenience of traveling any distance for change of clothing.

39. They should open to outside light and air. (See section I-A-3.)

##### I. Construction of building:

40. If a separate structure, the building should be of substantial fire-resisting construction.

While fireproof construction is recommended, there is no objection to construction conforming to that of other plant buildings.

41. Wash and locker rooms located in the same building with toilet should be completely separated by partition. These rooms may be joined by swinging or self-closing doors. It is preferable that wash and locker rooms should be separated by partitions.

To prevent steam and moisture escaping from wash room to locker room and wetting the clothes in the lockers; to insure the best sanitary conditions in places where employees leave their personal belongings while at work.

42. The rooms should be of sufficient size to allow men to use equipment conveniently without interference with each other.

J. Interior finish of building:

43. Floors and walls should be of concrete or nonabsorbent material. Floors should slope toward the drain.

Concrete or cement with smooth hard surface is considered satisfactory in all cases, except for special installations where a more elaborate finish may be desired. The material can be made nonabsorbent by proper care in construction of mixture and by the use of compounds applied to the concrete after it has been laid.

44. Drain should be located under equipment so that water will run toward and not away from fixtures.

45. Walls, ceilings, and partitions should be light in color to give a neat appearance, increase illumination, and facilitate cleaning.

46. Sufficient window space should be provided to afford adequate light and ventilation.

Too much importance can not be attached to the liberal admission of sunlight—"the most efficient of all germicides."

47. Rooms should also be adequately lighted artificially. Light should be so distributed that fixtures will be thoroughly lighted and no dark corners will exist.

48. The room should be provided with adequate and suitable heating facilities.

49. Heating pipe or radiators should be so installed as to give ample space below and behind same for cleaning purposes.

50. Permanent hose connection should be provided for thoroughly flushing and cleaning rooms.

K. Fixtures:

51. No washbasins or troughs for common use should be installed. Facilities for washing hands and face should be such that employees must necessarily wash from the flowing stream.

The washbasin with stopper is unsanitary. This requirement is designed to prevent the transmission of disease through the common use of a washing fixture made to contain water.

52. Fixtures for washing the hands and face should be so spaced that a man can wash without splashing his neighbor.

53. The number of faucets for washing hands and face should be not less than one to every six employees, based upon the maximum number employed on a single turn in the department using the equipment. Regular showers may be substituted in part for these faucets.

54. Both hot and cold water should be provided for each fixture.

55. Clothes hooks should be provided.

L. Lockers:

56. A locker or other method of caring for change of clothing, etc., should be provided for each employee who has a fixed place of work.

Clothes lockers should be located in buildings or enclosures in conjunction with washing facilities.

57. Lockers should be of steel and have proper ventilation. They should be at least 4 inches off the floor, to facilitate cleaning without contaminating locker.

58. Size of lockers should be not less than 12 by 15 inches floor space.

M. Showers:

59. The number of showers should be not less than one to every 25 employees, based upon the maximum number employed on a single turn in the department using the equipment.

This proportion may be varied according to the character of the work.

60. Each shower should be separated by partition—

To encourage men to use the showers, who would otherwise not do so.

To prevent the user splashing his neighbor.

61. The enclosure should be finished in a light color to give a neat appearance and facilitate cleaning.

62. Showers should have hot and cold water and be equipped with a hot and cold water regulating valve.

The system should be arranged to prevent scalding. This does not necessarily imply the need of a thermostatic control for each shower in a battery of showers. Where such automatic control is necessary it can ordinarily be attached to the heater.

63. Regulating device should be so located that it can be operated without standing under the shower.

64. Supply pipes to showers should be placed overhead to avoid the possibility of a person coming in contact with the hot pipes, and to facilitate the cleaning of the shower enclosure.

N. Care:

65. Special men should be delegated to attend to cleaning of washrooms.

This means a man who devotes sufficient time to keeping the sanitary installations clean. Large installations may require a special attendant, but one man can probably take care of several small installations.

The mere providing of sanitary equipment is not sufficient; the equipment should also be maintained in a manner to make it attractive and inviting.

#### SECTION V.—DRINKING WATER.

O. Requirements:

66. Fountains should be located convenient to where men work.

67. They should be made attractive, should be preferably white in color, and should be kept clean.

68. They should be so designed as to make it impossible for a person drinking to put his lips on the outlet for water.

69. They should be so constructed that of necessity a person must drink from a stream or jet, not from an overflowing bowl. Investigation shows that when fountains are installed of a type that allows a person to put his lips to the outlet for water, many people do put their mouths over the end of the nozzle and drink from it in a sucking fashion. This is an insanitary practice and may be the means of spreading disease.

70. They should be so arranged that waste water will be carried away without slopping.

Recommendations made by the sanitation committee that should be considered as a part of these general requirements:

1. Each subsidiary company is to make a bacteriological analysis of all water used for drinking purposes at least once a year, or oftener if necessary, where there is any question as to the purity of the drinking water supply, and also that a permanent record be kept of all such analyses made. (Sanitation committee's recommendation of April, 1912.)

2. The use of the common drinking cup in offices of the United States Steel Corporation, and in offices, mills, and works of its subsidiary companies should be discontinued as soon as, and wherever practicable, and it is recommended that there be substituted as soon as practicable, conveniently located, sanitary drinking fountains. (Sanitation committee's recommendation of Dec. 22, 1913.)

3. As the roller or common towel is a prolific source of disease, its use should be abolished and the individual or hand towel substituted. This applies to all towels furnished by the companies. The use, in common, of towels furnished by the employees themselves should be prohibited. (Sanitation committee's recommendation of Dec. 19, 1912.)

#### GIRL'S DINING ROOM AND LOCKER ROOM, SHENANGO WORKS, AMERICAN SHEET AND TIN PLATE COMPANY.

The process of assorting and inspecting tin plate is done by girls. This work is done in the assorting room, which is so located in the plants of the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co. as to isolate them, as much as possible, from the remainder of the mill. Rest rooms are provided for these employees where they are furnished with seats, clothes lockers, washing facilities and lunch tables.

A janitress is employed to keep the interior of the building in good condition. Each girl is given an individual locker, individual towel and drinking cup and is provided with two kimono aprons and caps. These are blue, trimmed with white. The uniforms are furnished by the company and are kept laundered and in repair by the users. The girls are much pleased with the idea. A better feeling has been promoted through the use of these uniforms, as the foreign-born girls were not formerly quite as careful of their appearance as they might have been, but this condition has changed since these working dresses have been adopted.

#### RESTAURANTS.

The success attending the operation of plant restaurants already installed by the subsidiary companies and the benefits resulting therefrom have encour-

aged many more installations of like character in other plants of the subsidiary companies. In addition to giving the employees an opportunity to secure good, wholesome food at moderate cost, there are other benefits more diversified in character than might appear at first thought. These can best be summed up by quoting from Mr. E. W. Pargny's article appearing in the *American Iron and Steel Institute Bulletin*, issue of August, 1914:

"When laboring overtime or breakdown or emergency work, the employee can secure a full meal at his usual dinner hour.

"Workers in exposed situations during severe weather can be refreshed by a portion of hot soup or coffee.

"When exhausted by heat or physical exertion in warm weather, a refreshing draught obtained when most needed frequently enables an employee to return to work with renewed vigor when otherwise he would be incapable of useful exertion for a considerable time. The aromatic bottled drinks furnished at practically all of our restaurants seem to supply the necessary stimulation to overcome abdominal cramp among workers laboring in heated positions, the cramp being frequently superinduced by injudicious drinking of water when one is suffering from stomach derangement or careless exposure of the person to strong currents of air.

"The burden of the housewife in the daily preparation of the dinner bucket, following the serving of an early morning meal, is eliminated. Where father and son have both to be provided for, as is often the case, the burden is by no means a light one.

"When the wife is ailing or away from home, or sickness occurs among the little ones, the breadwinner may have to undertake the unfamiliar role of household cook—sometimes with disastrous results to his own internal well-being, not to mention that of his family. Where a mill restaurant is available, a half hour earlier start from the house secures him an inviting breakfast at a moderate cost.

"An equally important consideration is the selection of the contents of the dinner bucket. The most desirable forms of food are not always adapted to packing, nor will they retain their freshness and palatability after standing for several hours in unsuitable temperatures, as is often their fate. It is not uncommon in rolling mills to see a large proportion of the contents thrown away because of its unpalatable or uninviting condition. As a further argument to prove the inadequacy of the packed lunch when put up by inexperienced housekeepers it may be stated that, not to speak of the questionable assimilative value of certain articles and combinations of food frequently found therein, fairly numerous cases occur of men who, after consuming the contents during the noon period, visit the restaurant in the afternoon to purchase a 10 or 15 cent meal.

"For the unmarried man lodging in rooms—and especially those who do not or cannot obtain their meals at a boarding house—the higher prices prevailing in public restaurants is a condition not always easy for the young man to meet. Here again the problem of the dinner bucket has to be confronted, with the added difficulty however of getting the bucket filled with the things one likes, or that seem to best meet his particularly requirements. The unmarried man and the foreign day laborer are usually good patrons of that section of the mill restaurant counter where such tasty items as fruit, cake or dessert provide a welcome addition to the somewhat monotonous fare of the boarding house."

#### VISITING NURSES.

The work of the visiting or neighborhood nurses, has been continued with such success that these activities have been extended to other operations of the subsidiary company with some 62 nurses employed in the work. The service is confined strictly to nursing, carried on under the direction of the employing company, and does not apply to the work similar in character, directed by benevolent societies composed of the employees themselves. The assistance rendered by these nurses is of both professional and practical value. The object of this service is to improve the general health and increase the happiness of the employees and their families. The principal duty of the nurse is to give instructions in those things which will enable the employees to better their condition mentally, physically and materially. Her services are offered free by the company to the employees and their families, but are not forced upon them; she is not permitted to visit the homes of the employees upon any occasion unless requested to do so by a member of the family.



But opportunities of giving instruction and advice in matters of household sanitation, economical purchasing of home necessities, care of children, especially in infancy, and the numerous and perplexing problems confronting the mother are presented through her ability and willingness to help in cases of sickness. Therefore, the nurse must be skilled in her profession, and must also be tactful and of a pleasing personality, so that she will be a welcome visitor in the homes in whatever capacity her presence may be required. Her genuine interest and desire to be of assistance in time of trouble wins the confidence of the people, and she becomes the counsellor, helper and friend from whom they seek aid and advice, knowing that any problem submitted to her will be given careful consideration.

The work of these visiting nurses may be briefly outlined as follows:

1. Attending the sick.
2. Giving instruction in personal and domestic hygiene and in domestic science.
3. Helping the families to deal with financial, physical, marital and other domestic troubles.

#### PRACTICAL HOUSEKEEPING CENTERS.

At some of the plants and mining towns of the subsidiary companies special courses in practical housekeeping are arranged by the companies for the benefit of the wives and children of the employees. Special instructors, usually the visiting or district nurses, are employed for this purpose.

Some companies provide houses or special rooms and equipment for the maintenance of this work, which includes all phases of the preparing and cooking of foods, the care and feeding of babies, dressmaking, and many other phases of domestic science, even to the proper methods of making beds.

The houses usually selected for the work are plain and simple in style, containing either three or four rooms—the type of dwelling occupied by the miners or other employees. They are furnished simply but neatly, the furnishings selected being such as are within the means of the employees. The purpose is to furnish an object lesson for the wives and daughters of the employees by illustrating what may be accomplished in the way of convenience, comfort, and attractiveness within their means. These houses serve also as homes and headquarters for the nurses.

These household centers are becoming important factors in the communities where they are established. The families of the employees welcome the idea of the centers and refer all sorts of problems to the nurses. In fact, the nurse becomes a sort of family counselor.

The following are some of the activities carried on at these practical housekeeping centers:

1. Classes for children in sewing, cooking, and housekeeping.
2. Meetings for the women of the community for instruction in infant welfare, cooking, sewing, housekeeping, public health, and hygiene.
3. A club for the small girls of the community under the direction of the nurse. These clubs are self-governing, with constitution, by-laws, and officers.
4. A club for the boys of the community, under leadership of a young man, with definite rules covering the conduct, activities, and qualifications of the boys for membership. The boys help to formulate these rules and therefore feel themselves bound to enforce them.
5. A club or association, under the direction of the nurse, for women employees of the company, to afford those women employed in domestic service or similar isolated duties opportunities to mingle socially with the other members of the community.

#### PLAYGROUNDS.

The many good results obtained through the establishment and maintenance of playgrounds at the various plants and mines of our subsidiary companies justify the attempt to provide attractive places for the children and encourage further efforts in this direction.

In many cases the companies are compelled, because of the immediate need for playgrounds in certain localities, to utilize whatever ground may be available; thus a neglected piece of property cleared of its rubbish and equipped with the more popular playground apparatus, and it immediately becomes an attractive place for the children. Many of the playgrounds are located within the plants or works, frequently adjoining the mill yards. Occasionally the

playgrounds are turned over to the municipal authorities and are operated by them, the company contributing to the maintenance and upkeep.

The children appreciate the advantage afforded by these pleasure grounds and are enthusiastic in their patronage, the average daily attendance during the summer months in the 131 existing playgrounds throughout the companies being approximately 18,000. These recreation grounds and amusement facilities are not restricted to the use of the employees' children, but are free to the entire community.

The companies employ competent instructors—often the company nurse in the vicinity is the person best fitted for an instructor—to supervise the grounds and look after the children, and it is a source of great satisfaction to the busy mothers of large families to know that their children are safe and are being amused and instructed. Always, heretofore there has been the difficulty of keeping the children out of the streets and alleys, where they are in constant danger from the traffic.

The teachers join in the games of the children, making congenial playmates as well as good teachers and tactfully encourage the games most conducive to health and mental development. Also the children are taught arts of various kinds—basketry, sewing, and various other handicrafts. Frequently the young women in the neighborhood of the plants or mines volunteer their services to the company during their leisure hours and are most helpful in directing the interest and attention of the children to worthwhile games and beneficial recreation. The children are instructed and apt pupils and, under the leadership of these older girls and the instructors, their abilities develop along many lines which will prove of practical value to them in later life. Moreover, in their desire to excel in their games, there is the stimulus of friendly rivalry.

Near some of the playgrounds are welfare houses or nurseries where the children can go during the colder months and where the nurses in charge make things cheerful and inviting for them. Gradually this work assumes many phases—the formation of clubs, classes in various branches of kindergarten work, and finally practical housekeeping; and usually we have found that the children are glad and eager to take advantage of such opportunities, and join in the activities afforded them with genuine interest and enjoyment.

A popular and attractive feature is the wading pool in the playground, always refreshing to the youngsters on hot summer days. There are larger swimming pools also for the older boys and girls and the adults; but very often these are located apart from the playgrounds, near the mills, or in connection with the company clubs, where they are easy of access should the men desire to use them before or after working hours.

Adjoining the playgrounds the company provided athletic fields for the older boys, where baseball or other outdoor sports may be enjoyed. At the present time there are 86 such fields, and apparently they are as popular with the older boys as are the playgrounds with the smaller children.

In each of these playgrounds the company has installed toilet and washing facilities adequate to take care of the average daily attendance; also sanitary drinking fountains are provided; and all these facilities are readily accessible so that the children may obey the slightest inclination to use them.

The influence of such wholesome outdoor life upon the health of the children can not be overestimated. It strengthens them both mentally and physically, and the teachings of the instructors are assimilated naturally and are applied to the everyday life of the children, resulting in the betterment of their home conditions.

#### GARDENS.

The efforts of the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiary companies to encourage garden work among the employees can not be considered purely as a war measure, although the necessity for thrift occasioned by the war has been the prime incentive for extending this work and encouraging the employees to further efforts. For years the subsidiary companies have offered special inducements to the employees to utilize unoccupied land for the raising of vegetables. Usually the company plows the ground at its own expense—occasionally this expense is prorated among the employees using the land—and plots it out, and then offers prizes for the gardens. And particularly in the mining villages, like encouragement is given to the employees for the development of home gardens. Last year there were 2,714 acres of gardens on company property.

## VEGETABLE CELLARS.

Usually the quantity of vegetables raised in the gardens of the employees is far beyond their immediate needs, and much is wasted for lack of storage facilities. To overcome this difficulty in a measure, the Oliver Iron Mining Co., during the summer and autumn of 1917, built at several of the mining towns on the Minnesota Range cellars for the use of employees where vegetables could be stored during the winter months. One of these cellars was built in Virginia and one in Chisholm for employees in those two towns. Three were built in Hibbing, one in the Penobscot location, one in the Morris location, and one in the Kerr location. In addition to the cellars, an elaborate storehouse was erected last year in Hibbing for municipal purposes, but it was not completed until late in the season, after the crops had been gathered.

Generally speaking, the arrangement of individual bins with individual locks has been found the most satisfactory. One of the cellars in which the crops were stored in sacks last winter has been remodeled so that each user may have an individual bin. No artificial heat was used in any of the cellars last winter and, during the coldest weather, an even temperature at a safe point above 32° F. was maintained. These cellars have proven very satisfactory since the vegetables stored in them were kept in excellent condition through the winter and well into the spring and summer.

## CLUBS.

Many of the subsidiary companies have provided commodious and well-equipped clubhouses for the use of their employes, members of their families and friends. The features are:

Dormitories, reading room and library, gymnasium and swimming pool, baths (tub and shower), auditorium and dance hall, billiard and pool rooms, bowling alleys, basket-ball halls with motion pictures, lectures, concerts, smokers, musicals, etc.

The subsidiary companies pay all taxes and insurance and furnish heat. All other expenses are borne by the club members, the initiation fees and monthly dues being very small.

Reading rooms are supplied with the current magazines and periodicals, daily papers, and a good assortment of books. The social entertainments are a feature of the clubs. The affairs of the clubs are handled by the members themselves, in the usual way.

## GOOD-FELLOW CLUBS.

At the South Works of the Illinois Steel Co., where the nurse employed is a member of the Visiting Nurse Association, there has been organized among the superintendents and workmen a Good-Fellow Club to work in cooperation with the nurse. The members of the club contribute 50 cents per month (or any amount greater or smaller which they may care to contribute) to a fund to be drawn upon by the nurse for relieving temporarily such distress as requires immediate attention until permanent relief can be provided through the regular avenues. This obviates the delay attendant upon regular procedure. The nurse uses this fund as she deems wise. It may be for the purchase of a bed, or necessary food and cooking utensils, or a special diet for a sick person, clothing for the children, etc.

During the summer this Good-Fellow Club maintained a small playground on some vacant lots in a congested neighborhood near the mill. A woman was in constant attendance and the nurse made several visits a day. In this playground the little children could be watched and cared for, and it is the general opinion that many cases of illness among the children were prevented.

As shown by the foregoing, the scope of the work of these nurses is very broad, covering, in addition to those duties already enumerated, all features of kindergarten work, the training of the Little Mothers Clubs in cooking, sewing and all other phases of good housekeeping, the proper care and feeding of infants, the care of children on picnics, etc. They exert a wide influence which is apparent not only in the betterment of present home conditions of employees, but also makes for stronger and better men and women in the future generation of mine and mill workers.

## THE GOOD FELLOWSHIP CLUB OF MORGAN PARK.

The Good Fellowship Club, Morgan Park, started with the Good Fellowship Club of the blooming, rail and rail finishing end of Minnesota Steel Co., organized December 18, 1917. This department organization met with such approval that by request of all the other departments it was expanded January 29, 1918, to include all the departments of the Minnesota Steel Co. The original officers and committees were retained and the necessary additional representatives from the other departments were added, together with a general secretary and treasurer. On May 1, 1918, a visiting nurse was added to the club to relieve wherever possible the investigating and rendering aid in needy cases heretofore done by relief committee.

*Organization.*—The organization consists of a president, vice president, general secretary and treasurer, board of directors, central relief committee, department committees, publicity committee, and a visiting nurse. Various other committees are appointed when necessary.

*Object of the club.*—The object of the Good Fellowship Club is to help all its members who are in need and also other special charitable cases brought to the attention of the club and approved by the board of directors. The Good Fellowship Club is not a benefit association; it is a charitable organization, and no stipulated sum is to be paid to any of its members or any one else. The State compensation law takes care of most of the accidents to employees; the Good Fellowship Club is meant to help the needy case in sickness and other kinds of distress not covered by the compensation act. The work of the Good Fellowship Club has not only been of financial aid but has also helped in many ways. Through the means of the Good Fellowship Club, the payment of insurance policies has been hurried up; it has acted as a mediator in getting garnishments lifted and in having credit extended when the party was in need. The members of the club are expected to apply for aid when they feel the club can be of any assistance to them. The visiting nurse on relief work gives assistance and instructions to help the comfort and welfare of the families.

*Aid rendered.*—In case of death of a member of one of his immediate family, a floral offering is sent by the club. Financial and other aid is given to worthy cases and a loan without interest may be made by the club if needed. These loans to be paid back in small sums monthly when the recipient is able to do so. In some cases the person helped by the club is sent to the hospital and the hospital bill is paid. In some cases the doctor's bills are paid. All aid is passed upon by the board of directors, composed of the superintendents of all departments and certain other persons elected by the club membership from their own number. In case of a donation or aid given, the name of the person helped in not made public, though, if one is interested in some particular case, he can find out the particulars and the club's aid by consulting the general secretary.

Notice of all cases is sent through the department committee to the general secretary, who brings the matter to the president, who refers it to the visiting nurse or the central relief committee to investigate. The report of investigation is read before the board of directors at the regular meeting or special meeting to determine the amount and character of the aid, which is governed by the need of the case.

*Growth of membership.*—The membership of the Good Fellowship Club is rapidly increasing until now, five months since its start, there are 2,500 members out of a total of 3,200 employees who are giving an average of \$700 monthly to the Good Fellowship Club.

The contributions are voluntary and range from 25 cents a month to 50, 75 cents, and \$1 or more a month per person.

At first the monthly contributions were collected personally from the members by the local secretaries, but now this plan has been superseded by a more efficient system of the members signing an application card which authorizes the Minnesota Steel Co. to deduct a monthly sum from their pay. To each of the members buttons are furnished at a nominal sum bearing the scroll "G. F. C." Also a membership card is given all members.

## HOUSING.

Due to the increased labor forces and the very great scarcity of dwellings, it has been necessary for the subsidiary companies to build a large number

of houses to accommodate the workmen. Much thought and study was given to designs and plans of these houses with a view to giving the workman a home with modern comforts and at a moderate monthly rental. Many of them are sold to the employees with small initial payment and on easy monthly installments over a period of years.

Following is a brief description of the more recent towns built by the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation, which may be of interest.

#### MORGAN PARK.

Morgan Park was established with the intent of housing the nucleus of the labor force of the Minnesota Steel Co. and its attendant industries, the Universal Portland Cement Co., and the local yards of the Duluth, Missabe & Northern Railroad—all subsidiaries of United States Steel Corporation. Suitable and attractive housing facilities have been provided in reasonable amounts for every class of employee; the managing force, administrative force, skilled and unskilled workmen. Of the 3,000 employees of the steel plant, some 400 families are now housed, and 40 more of other subsidiaries, in addition to which about 350 unmarried employees are accommodated in company-built boarding houses and in private families. About one-half of the residence district has been developed to the present time. The consideration which made it necessary to provide houses for the workmen in this isolated district, also demanded that the community be self-contained, at least for some years to come. Provisions have heretofore been made for all essentials of community life: namely, stores and business offices, education, recreation, playgrounds, hospital, entertainment, religion, social service, water supply, fuel, refuse disposal, street cleaning, fire and police protection, electric light, sewer systems, and postal and express service. Business and civic centers have been established and such districting or grouping of the various classes of dwelling houses as seemed necessary under the circumstances.

*Location.*—Morgan Park is within the city limits of Duluth, whose population in 1918 was estimated to be 105,000. The city limits extend north and south for some 25 miles, the park being a little over 10 miles south of the business center.

*Topography.*—The town is located on a plateau some 40 feet above and overlooks Spirit Lake and the St. Louis River. Wide ravines separate it from the steel plant on the south and from adjoining territory on the north, and these are made use of as natural park areas. Smaller ravines originally extended into the town site; these had to be filled in order to carry out the most desirable street plan. The foundations of some of the houses were carried down to 20 feet and over in some places, to attain this result.

*Town plan.*—The street layout presents an interesting combination of straight, curved, and radial streets. The long, winding approach and the encircling drives and occasional curved streets made necessary by local conditions give a pleasing variation from the more economical rectangular blocks which occupy the center of the town.

The main thoroughfare, upon which the main car line is located, divides the town into two principal sections. This avenue is 80 feet wide, with concreted driveways on either side of the car tracks. The business, educational, and recreational center of the town is divided by the thoroughfare which finds its southerly limit at the disembarking point for the steel plant and thence continues westerly through Morgan Park to the adjoining communities. This thoroughfare is paved through for some  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles beyond the park.

The secondary streets are 50 feet wide. All streets are paved with concrete, with park strips and trees on either side, between curb and sidewalk. All sidewalks, house walks, and alleys are of concrete.

Houses are set back 30 feet from the lot line. The front lawns are sodded and planted with shrubbery groups and the rear lots laid out for kitchen gardens. Deliveries are made from the alleys.

The alleys in the older portions of the town have open ends, permitting a view down the length of the block from the cross streets. In the latter portions of the town they are turned or intersected by transverse alleys near the ends of the blocks to avoid this view.

The lot widths in the present developed area vary in accordance with the width of the structures thereon, the purpose being to maintain a minimum width of 20 feet between adjoining structures, whether they be detached houses, flats, or terrace houses. The northerly lot lines are placed close to

the northerly side of the building, to give maximum space on the south side for the growth of flowers, grass, and shrubbery. Vines are planted around each house.

All telephone and electric light wires are underground, continuous lines of house conduits being carried down the length of the block through the basements. Service lines are laid in the alleys, outside the pavement. Fire hydrants at street intersections, and, in the larger blocks, at intermediate points.

*Public service.*—Water supply: Spring water is obtained from two spring wells some 700 feet apart, delivering into a central pump house and ground-level reservoir and from thence into an elevated water tank. This supply is used for drinking, washing, bathing, and ice making. River water from another pump house is used for lawn sprinkling, toilets, and fire protection. The piping system is dual throughout.

The main lines are of equal diameter throughout, so that the water supply may be taken in at either the north or south end. This arrangement will permit the substitution of the city water for the present supply, should occasion arise in the future.

*Sewer system.*—Separate storm and sanitary sewers are provided, the sanitary system being so arranged that a sewer-disposal plant may be put in at the main collecting sewer. At present the sewage discharges directly into the public waters, as is done elsewhere throughout the city.

*Gaslight and telephone service.*—Gas mains are laid throughout the park, with connections into every dwelling. As in the case of the water supply, the principal main can be fed from either the north or south end with equal facility.

Electric light and telephone wires are everywhere underground, with branch conduits extending longitudinally through the blocks of houses. The street-light conduits are laid in the grass strips between curb and sidewalk.

Street cleaning, fuel distribution, refuse disposal, fire and police protection: So far all this work has been performed by the company, which also provides the ash cans and kitchen-refuse cans. Receptacles are provided at certain street corners for waste paper.

*Permanent housing.*—The materials used in the building of all houses in the park have been chosen with the view of providing dwellings that are attractive, practically fireproof, durable, comfortable, and involving a minimum maintenance and depreciation cost. Cement is used throughout for the exterior walls, in the form of concrete blocks (both pressed and cast) and stucco. The blocks, with the natural surface exposed, give a pleasing texture and coloration to the exterior which is superior in appearance to any applied finish and entails no maintenance cost. Special care has been taken to vary the outline by avoiding a succession of similar house designs. There are some 32 different designs in use, either as detached houses, single and double flat dwellings, and terrace or row houses. Provision has been made for every class of employee to a greater or less extent, namely, the managing, superintending and administrative officials, technical force, skilled men, and the unskilled labor, and the sizes of the dwellings range from 4 to 9 rooms. There are also boarding houses for men and women, in large and small units, and for the single men among the unskilled workmen.

The floors everywhere are of concrete with either hardwood or cement finish, according to the character of the building. Inside walls are furred and plastered. Some of the later houses are decorated with a washable fabric, others being tinted and, in some cases, painted. All exterior walls have air spaces to insure warmth. The earlier houses are roofed with cedar shingles, and the later ones with tile of various colors. All doors and windows are screened and provided with storm sash. Complete provision is made throughout for sanitary plumbing, baths, electric lights, gas connections, and hot and cold water. Hot-air furnaces are also supplied throughout, except in a very few instances in the unskilled labor district, where stoves are used. Every dwelling has a kitchen garden, concrete house walks, ash and refuse cans, and clothes' poles, grassed lawn and concrete sidewalk in front. Shrubby is planted at corner lots and between the buildings, with vines on the sunny side of each house, and maintained by the company.

*Better-class residences.*—Of the 46 houses constructed in 1917, on the northern limit of the residential district, a group of 30 is laid in the form of a residential park with winding streets, upon a wooded tract of particular beauty. The trees and natural contour of the ground have been preserved as fully as possible and each house located to obtain the best view from the

living rooms. The houses, which are all detached and on large lots, constitute the most expensive type considered necessary at any time in the town, being provided with glass-enclosed porches, inclosed rear porches, fireplaces, large basements with laundry, concrete coal and vegetable cellars, tile roofs, and furnaces with automatic humidifying devices, ample closets and trunk rooms, and in some cases additional bathrooms are also provided. The houses run in size from 5 to 10 rooms.

The group of 349 dwellings of the better class built in 1915, which occupy the remainder of the eastern section of the park, consists of detached houses, single and double flats, and row houses—169 structures in all. There are 77 detached, 110 single flats, 40 double flats, and 120 row houses in this group, and the number of rooms from 4 to 8. The single houses are arranged on the exterior of the group and the multiple apartment houses in the center and along the main thoroughfare.

*Low rental houses.*—The first unit consists of a group of 42 family dwellings, 3 boarding houses for single men, and a neighborhood house, or club, for the section of which this unit is the nucleus. These were built in 1916-17, as the result of an attempt to develop for this climate a type of low-rental dwelling for the unskilled worker, which would combine the features of inexpensiveness, durability, attractiveness, sanitary qualities, low-depreciation cost, resistance to fire and weather, and pleasant surroundings, with possibilities for social gatherings and recreation.

In this unit, instead of a central alley lengthwise through the block an alley has been provided in the immediate rear of each dwelling, and the kitchen gardens and clothesline space grouped in the center. The purpose of doing so is fourfold: To avoid the shovelling of snow on rear house walks to a central alley; to reduce to a minimum the area at the back of the house to be kept in good order; to avoid the necessity for travel through gardens, except when under cultivation; and to protect the gardens against the inroads of children and dogs. The right-angle turn on the ends of the alleys cuts off the view through the alley from the cross street.

Other incidental advantages of this arrangement are that the alley pavement, being sloped to the center, forms a channel for the removal of surface water, and that the total amount of pavement required is less than with a central alley. Fences and clothes poles are provided within the garden area and plank walks for the clotheslines.

In front of the houses, while the 30-foot setback from the street line has been maintained, the front sidewalk parallel with the street has been moved close to the building, so that the area of front lawn between the house and sidewalk to be kept in good order by the resident has been reduced to a space to which he is likely to give proper attention. The remaining front lawn is kept in order by the company.

The dwellings are entirely of the row or terrace type, for economy in cost of construction and in heating, but monotony of outline is avoided by the varied form of exterior, by the alteration of 2 and 3 story dwellings, and by limiting the rows to 4, 8, and 10 houses each.

The houses vary in size from four to six rooms, some with basement and some without, the latter predominating. Three methods of heating are used—the kitchen range, with heating drum upstairs in the bath room; a heating furnace on first floor of the kitchen, where no basement is provided; and a heating furnace in the basement. In the types without basements, concrete coal boxes are provided on the first floor, either in the kitchen under the stairway or on the rear porch.

Bathrooms with wash basins, bathtub, and toilet are provided for each house, hot-water tank with water-back connections for range in the kitchen, fuel gas connections, sink, laundry tub, electric light, fly screens, double glass windows, storm doors with convertible glass or fly-screen panel, metallic weather stripping, sound-proof party walls, and a washable cloth fabric for all interior walls. The floors and stairs are of concrete, colored with a dark-red pigment in the finish coat. To illustrate to the prospective residents how the unresilient feature of cement floors can be overcome, some of the dwellings were temporarily equipped with various carpet and linoleum materials of inexpensive character as exhibit houses and kitchen cabinets of suitable type were exhibited to illustrate the possibility in economy of floor and wall space in these compactly arranged dwellings. Separate refuse cans for ashes and kitchen waste are provided for each dwelling.

The roofs are of wood shingle underlaid with waterproof paper and roofing boards, with an air space and attic spaces made wind-tight and where possible,

arranged as storage space. The exterior walls are of wood studding covered with plaster board, waterproof paper, cement stucco on wire mesh and painted. The inside surface is covered with plaster board, wood fiber plaster and washable fabric in various patterns. In conformity with good housing standards, especially where boarders are considered, none of the bedrooms open into each other, though the practice of taking in boarders is not encouraged.

To further reduce the construction cost and depreciation factor, roof gutters and conductors are omitted and gravel strips provided to catch the drip; concrete floors of front and rear porches are laid as floating slabs to avoid danger by frost action; the double glass windows avoid the expense and maintenance of storm windows and of a space to store them; and the window screens are of half-size and intended to remain in position where no basements are provided. The lack of basements and inclosed rear porches in some of these houses has made evident the necessity for other means to provide suitable storage space and to enable the rear yards to be kept in orderly condition. These plans have been worked out and will be put into effect very shortly.

The three boarding houses for single men occupy the north side of the block and are separated from the family dwellings by a transverse alley and sufficient grounds north of the alley for use of the boarders. The buildings contain accommodations for 26, 44, and 26, respectively, each with its own dining room and family quarters for the housekeeper and force, separated entirely from the boarders' quarters. The boarders' sleeping rooms are high, 8 by 10, equipped with steel bed, bed spring, mattress, sheets and blankets, chair, table, wardrobe, waste basket, laundry bag, and curtains, and with inlet and return registers. The toilet rooms have hot and cold water, shower baths, wash basins with "flowing stream" faucets. The general construction, interior decorations, and other general details are similar to the dwelling houses.

The Neighborhood House is located on the south side of the block and separated from the dwelling houses by a transverse alley, as on the north end. It adjoins the street car line connecting Morgan Park with the adjoining settlements of Gary and New Duluth, where the greater percentage of the unskilled workers now live. Across the street, on the south, a tract of several acres has been reserved as a playground for this district.

This building is intended to serve as a recreation and social center for the district. The entire upper floor is laid out as an auditorium or dance hall, with a dining room and large kitchen in connection, which is also used for instruction in domestic science. On the first floor is a men's clubroom, a women's clubroom, a dispensary, visiting-nurse office, barber shop, small store, and toilet for men and women, with shower baths. In the basement are four large rooms capable of being used as reading rooms, recreation rooms, classrooms, or for kindergarten and children's playrooms, as occasion requires. The rooms are so arranged as to give the greatest degree of variety in the use of the building to meet the changing needs of the local residents as the personnel or requirements of the residents vary from time to time or the district increases in size.

As an example of this adaptability of the building, one of the two churches is in course of completion, and the other, a Protestant Union Church, is being planned. All religious services and Sunday schools are now carried on here without interference with one another or with the secular functions. Meetings of the Community Club (the local civic league) and the Red Cross work meetings, dances, and entertainments are carried on in the auditorium; a children's playroom in the barber shop, a boys' club in the store; while cooking classes are held in the kitchen. The school building, with its opportunities for larger forms of community activities, athletics, library, and evening classes, is in the adjoining block.

#### HOUSE DEVELOPMENT AT WILSON STATION, PA., FOR THE BY-PRODUCT COKE PLANT.

The property used for the Wilson House development for Carnegie Steel Co. is a tract of about 90 acres located on the hillside above the Pennsylvania Railroad at Wilson Station, Pa., 18.5 miles southeast from Pittsburgh and within easy walking distance of the Clairton By-Product Coke Plant.

The ground is very rough, with steep slopes, the property being cut in several places by deep hollows or ravines. This property has been laid out as a plan of lots 20 years ago but has never been developed. The steel company abandoned the old layout and redesigned the streets, following the contours more closely, thereby obtaining easier grades.



The streets are 40 feet in width, with the exception of Wilson Avenue, which is 50 feet, and Lincoln Way, which is 30 feet. The lots in general have a frontage of 40 feet, with variations in depth caused by the irregular layout of the streets. The buildings are set from 20 to 25 feet back from the street lines and the width of street paving kept at a minimum.

Sanitary and storm sewers are laid throughout the plan, the sewage being taken care of in a sewage-disposal plant constructed for that purpose between the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Monongahela River.

Water, gas, and electric service is being provided for the entire plan. All streets are to be paved and graded. The street paving will be of brick, on account of the steepness of the grades, otherwise the streets would have been constructed of concrete. Cement sidewalks are now under construction.

The plan is intersected near the center line by a deep ravine with steep-sloping sides. This ground is unsuitable for house construction, but being well timbered and having some natural beauty, it will be developed later as a park.

The buildings are designed for the use of the workmen employed in the By-Product Coke Plant north of Clairton Steel Works. The houses are single, double, and terrace types, with a number of double duplex houses, and several boarding houses accommodating, respectively 40, 24, and 16 men.

At the present time it is the intention to make no sales but to rent the houses to the workmen, the rentals to be established in line with those already existing in the borough. The southerly half of the plan will be used for housing the higher-paid workmen and some of the subsuperintendents; the northerly half will be used by the common laborers, while the 50 houses in Lincoln Way, which are separated from the balance of the plan by the topography of the ground, will be occupied by Negroes.

The foundations of all of the houses are of concrete with concrete footings. All basements are cemented.

In the construction of the first houses built, a large quantity of siding, shingle, and stucco was used, but the later construction consists of common brick exteriors, backed up with hollow tile. Asphaltum slate-covered shingles are being used on the roofs of all the later built houses, the red, green, and mottled colors giving a pleasing variety of appearance.

The floors in the better-class houses are of oak, as a supply of this timber was obtainable at a moderate cost; other floors are of yellow pine. The trim in the majority of houses is of yellow pine, and some birch is used.

Wood lath is used for the plastering, except on the outside walls, where plastering was applied on the hollow tile backing. The plastered walls will not be painted or tinted for sometime, until the danger of settling or cracking is over.

All houses are wired for electricity; they also have gas connections for hot-water, cooking, and bathroom heaters. In the better-class houses, medicine cabinets and heaters are provided in the bathrooms. In general, the houses contain four, five, and six rooms, some few seven and eight-room houses being constructed to meet the limited demand for houses of that size. Fifty 3-room houses were constructed in one of the hollows for the use of the Negro workmen. These were built of 5 by 12 face, red hollow tile, laid with black mortar, giving a very pleasant appearance.

All of the houses, excepting the 50 Negro houses, have bathrooms and bath-tub, lavatory, and toilets, the kitchens being provided with built-in cases and sinks, with hot and cold water. Kitchen ranges to be provided by the tenant.

The cellars contain hot-air furnaces, coal bins, hot-water heaters burning gas, and two part laundry trays. A special type of furnace was selected on account of its self-cleaning feature—no accumulation of ash dust being possible—and the water pan for moistening the air. The Negro houses are provided with combination laundry tray and sink, hot-water boiler, and toilets. The basements of these houses are not excavated.

A bathroom for the use of Negro workmen and women is being constructed at the entrance to Lincoln Way.

#### THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT FOR THE FAIRFIELD STEEL CO. AT SHEFFIELD, ALA.

*Location.*—Two miles west of Fairfield, and bordering on the property of the new works for the Fairfield Steel Co., the town of Westfield was established to house the colored workers of the plant. The Dolomite Road skirts this village on the northwest, affording access to Fairfield, Wylam, and Birmingham.

*Town site.*—Close to 200 acres are in the site—a long, narrow town, built on

the hillsides and in the valleys. A narrow ridge, well timbered, screens the town site from the noise and smoke of the steel plant, while natural gaps in this ridge afford easy access to the main entrance gates.

*Plan.*—Great care was observed in laying out the streets and house sites to preserve all good trees. The result has been a beautiful town at small cost for additional planting. Two paved roads have been built, cutting through the center of the town, and affording access to the Dolomite Road. All other streets are 50 feet wide, unpaved, with the trees left for shade and ornament. A sidewalk runs down the center of these residential streets, with housewalks leading from it. The lots average 90 feet in depth, and the houses are built 20 feet apart. Nine styles of houses have been built, all of the bungalow type. All houses are supplied with electric lights and running water. Ample fire protection is provided. The business center is adjacent to the commissary, and in close proximity to it are the barber shop and restaurant.

The community center adjoins the Plaza, where are located the school, kindergarten, clubhouse, and bath-house. Here also are the football and baseball fields and the tennis courts.

*Transportation.*—Dolomite Road is the automobile road leading to Fairfield. Plans are under consideration for a street car line from Westfield to Fairfield. A branch of the present Fairfield-Birmingham electric line now comes to the works at the southeast. The present system of transportation is by a privately owned automobile bus line.

*Planting.*—The planting in Westfield consists of native shrubbery, collected from the neighboring woods.

#### THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CHICKASAW SHIPBUILDING CO. AT CHICKASAW, ALA.

*Location.*—Telegraph Road, famous in Civil War history, bisects the entire site. Paralleling it is the Southern Railway. Skirting it to the south is the Alabama, Tennessee & Northern Railroad. Fronting it on the east is Chickasaw Creek and the Mobile River, while between these runs the Louisville & Nashville Railroad. Between the railroads and the river barges, good transportation is assured for the coal, iron, and ship plates from the north and passageway for the new ships to the south, 6 miles to Mobile and 30 miles more to the sea.

*Town site.*—This is divided distinctly into two sections, white and colored. These are separated by the main business district, which borders on Telegraph Road and the Southern Railway. The highest point in the whole area is 35 feet above sea level.

*Plan.*—For the through roads advantage has been taken of the natural valleys, thus securing easy grades. The high point near the center of the site was selected for the community center, and about this will be grouped the business district. From this center, railroad roads, 125 feet wide, extend northwest and southeast to the limits of the property. To the north and south of this center two roads lead through underpasses to the Negro section, where the main roads converge to the general office and the plant entrance.

*Development.*—In the white village all lots are 70 feet deep. Alleys are 15 feet wide. Residential streets are 40 feet wide. All houses here are built 100 feet center to center.

In the colored village all streets, alleys, and lots are of the same dimensions as those in the white section, only the houses are built 50 feet center to center.

In the village for white people the houses are plastered and have 4, 5, and 6 rooms, exclusive of bath, with sleeping porch and ample closet space.

In the village for colored people the houses are ceiled and have 2, 3, and 4 rooms, with inside sanitary connections.

All houses are screened, windows and front and back porches being completely inclosed. Eight or ten color combinations have been worked out for house painting, thus giving pleasing variety throughout the town. Houses are lighted by electricity and are supplied with water by Chickasaw Utilities Co.

*Transportation.*—The Mobile car system meets at Pritchard the company line, owned and operated by Chickasaw Utilities Co. Following Telegraph Road to the business section, this line makes a loop through the white village through the north underpass and across the colored village to the plant, and out again through the south underpass to Telegraph Road and back to Pritchard. Telegraph Road is the direct road to Mobile south, and to Montgomery and Birmingham north.

*Organization.*—Chickasaw is being built by the roads and buildings department of the Chickasaw Land Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation.

UNITED STATES COAL & COKE CO., LYNCH, HARLAN COUNTY, KY.

The United States Coal & Coke Co. in September, 1917, purchased approximately 20,000 acres of land at the headwaters of Poor Fork of Cumberland River in Harlan and Letcher Counties, Ky.

The company expects to produce 2,500,000 tons of coal per year, or 8,000 tons per day. Two thousand workmen will be needed to mine this quantity of coal, and these men, with their families, will require housing accommodations for 8,000 people. There are no surrounding towns of any considerable size—Harlan, the county seat of Harlan County, with a population of 2,000, being 20 miles distant; Pineville, Ky., a mining town of about 3,000 people, 60 miles; Knoxville, Tenn., 150 miles, and Louisville, Ky., 270 miles. As the railroad and mine buildings will occupy practically all the level land, it has been necessary, in order to have the employees within a reasonable distance of the mines, to erect dwellings for them on the mountain side.

In planning the town, the approximate area of which is 170 acres, and which will be completed in about two years, the following objects have been kept in mind:

First: Comfortable housing of employees.

Second: Healthful surroundings.

Third: Educational and religious opportunities.

Fourth: Recreation.

Fifth: Civic—to give employees the benefits and opportunities of a small city.

(1) To attain the first object, the dwellings have been substantially constructed with double floorings and storm sidings. Practically all houses are of wood, although some houses are being built of concrete blocks. The houses are of different designs, and vary in size from 3 to 10 rooms, in an endeavor to meet the requirements of different-sized families. Rooms are of ample size, wainscoted and plastered. All houses have electric lights and running water.

(2) To insure healthful living conditions, the dwelling houses are being constructed sufficiently far apart to afford each occupant plenty of fresh air and a small garden and yard. Each lot will be inclosed by a substantial fence. Receptacles will be provided for garbage.

Running water in abundance for washing and bathing facilities will be supplied from deep wells. A washhouse is being built with accommodations for 1,500 men. The town will be sewerred and each house connected with the main sewerage system leading to a sewerage-disposal plant, where the sewage will be treated and purified to insure the protection of people living along the lower stream.

That the population may receive the best medical attention, a hospital will be constructed and maintained. It will have wards for personal injury and surgical cases, a maternity ward and an isolation ward for contagious diseases.

(3) School sites have been set apart for both the white and the colored population. School districts will be organized in accordance with the laws of the State of Kentucky, and the officials of these school districts, who will be mostly employees of the Company, will be encouraged to erect modern grammar and high schools to enable the children of the community to be educated from the primary through the high schools without leaving home.

The various religious denominations of both the white and the colored population, when they form sufficiently large groups, will be encouraged to erect churches, and will receive substantial assistance in paying for them.

(4) To afford the relation necessary for the health and comfort of the people, amusement buildings with picture shows, bowling alleys, pool rooms, shooting galleries, and restaurants will be provided. Athletic and recreation fields will be provided in connection with high-school buildings in an endeavor to make the school buildings social and recreation centers, as well as educational institutions.

(5) The main streets of the town will be paved with concrete, while the laterals or less prominent streets will be macadam. Sidewalks, wherever possible, will be of concrete. Fire plugs will be connected with the main water system for fire protection.

A telephone exchange and lines will be provided and connections made where requested. Bank and hotel buildings will be erected and maintained for the accommodation of the people and the general public. Also a post office, barber shops, laundries, shoe shops, clothes cleaners, drug stores, etc.

To enable the people to purchase food, clothing, and household furnishings to the best advantage, a large department store, including a drug store in charge of a registered pharmacist, will be erected and operated by the United Supply Co., the various departments of which will be stocked with articles suitable for a community of this kind, to be sold at reasonable prices. The building will have four stories, including the basement and mezzanine floors, and will be constructed from the native sandstone for outer finish, with glass front 160 feet long, 20 feet high, which will include main storeroom, the mezzanine floor, and part of the furniture floors. Concrete and linatle floors will be laid in basement and main storeroom. The building will be furnished throughout with the best modern fixtures obtainable. Small stores will be conveniently located throughout the town to enable the people to purchase groceries and similar articles.

The preservation and sanitary care of perishable foods have been made special features in the construction and equipment of the store building.

There will be an ice-making and refrigerating plant with capacity to manufacture sufficient ice for domestic use and storage refrigerators containing 7,000 cubic feet of space, as well as for special butter, egg, and cheese refrigerators and 40 linear feet of meat and butter and 20 linear feet fresh vegetable refrigerator display counters, all constructed according to the most approved sanitary methods, principally of plate glass and white opalite glass, the floors of the meat market terrazo, and the walls opalite glass. A modern sanitary bakery, and of sufficient capacity to supply the community, will be a part of the equipment, with continuous ovens and electrically operated machinery.

To safeguard the health and welfare of the employees from the beginning of the development of the property, a sanitary department was created and put in charge of a doctor. This department's function was to keep the construction camp in a sanitary condition and to prevent typhoid fever, which is usually prevalent for the first two or three years in a new town, particularly in mining towns in unsettled sections of the country. The records to date, including the first complete summer, show only two cases of typhoid fever, imported from other localities.

All the work on this project, including 8 miles of railroad, has been done by the company's own construction forces.

At the present time 330 dwelling houses have been constructed and the hotel is practically finished.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE TOWN OF McDONALD, NEAR YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO—CARNEGIE STEEL CO.

The town of McDonald is located about 6½ miles west of Youngstown, 1½ miles west of Girard, and 3½ miles east of Niles, and is being constructed by the Conneaut Land Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, to house the employees of the McDonald mills of the Carnegie Steel Co., the first units of which are being operated and the other units nearing completion.

The site consists of about 550 acres, lying to the south of and directly across the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad from the McDonald mills, the land sloping gently from the south to the railroad. It is divided by avenues running north and south and named after the States and the Presidents, and by streets running east and west and numbered consecutively, commencing at the railroad. Ohio Avenue runs through nearly the center of the site and consists of two avenues, each 50 feet wide and separated by a strip 50 feet wide for a double-track street car line running from Youngstown to Niles. The other avenues and streets are 50 and 60 feet wide, and the avenues are 230 feet apart and the streets 550 feet apart, making the blocks 230 feet by 550 feet. In the center of the town and lying on both sides of Ohio Avenue, between Fifth and Sixth Streets, is a public square, each half of which is 230 feet by 550 feet. Directly east of and adjoining the public square is Woodland Park, consisting of about 30 acres of woodland broken by ravines and hills and making a pleasure spot of great natural beauty. In the southeastern part of the town is Glendale Park, consisting of about 20 acres of nicely located rolling land, with many natural advantages to be used as a playground and athletic field.

The business lots are 25 and 30 feet wide by 103 feet deep, with an alley 24 feet wide at the rear of each lot. The residence lots are 40 feet wide and 115 feet deep, except that in one section the lots are 50 feet wide by 150 feet deep, with many irregular-shaped lots of greater area. In this section the avenues and streets do not run at right angles with one another, but are arranged in sweeping curves and angles. All street improvements and connections are in place, the sidewalks are of concrete, 5 and 6 feet wide in the residence districts and wider in the business districts, and the avenues and streets are of concrete 23 feet wide with curb, except Ohio Avenue, which is 30 feet wide. Storm sewers are located in the avenues, and the sanitary sewers, gas, water, electric, and telephone service are located in the alley in the rear of all business property and on an easement across the rear of all residence property.

At present about 60 per cent of the dwellings are in what is known as the low-rental district and are of four, five, and six room types, with four double four-room houses. Those in the better district are of six and seven room type. The architecture is so varied that there will not be two houses alike on the same street, and is of a character harmonizing well with each other and the surrounding country. The exteriors are finished in narrow and wide siding, shingles, stucco, and brick, and, with the exception of the brick and stucco, are given one coat of creosote stain and two coats of lead and oil paint in harmonizing colors. The construction is of frame, brick veneer, solid brick and half brick, or stucco and half frame. The wood used in exteriors is either cypress or redwood. All dwellings have both front and rear porches.

Concrete footings are placed under all foundation walls, which are of monolithic concrete; basements have cement floors and drains to sewers; first and second floors are double with building paper between layers; roofs are covered with Hangor slate or different shades of Vermont slate with a few tile roofs; sidewalks and driveways to each house are of concrete; each cellar has a two-part cement laundry tray with hot and cold spigots in each tray and waste pipes connected with the sewer; a coal room is partitioned off from the rest of the cellar with access to the drive and equipped with a cast-iron chute with wire-glass panel; gas, water and electric motors are in the cellars and two shelves are placed for canned fruit storage in such a way that they can be partitioned off from rest of cellar for a cool room.

The kitchens and second floors of all dwellings and the first floor of the four-room houses are finished with yellow-pine floors and trim, and the main rooms and stairways of the five, six, and seven room houses are finished with oak floors and trim. Picture mold is placed in the main rooms and cement wainscot, 4½ feet high, is in all the bathrooms. The walls of the frame and brick veneer types are finished with Bestwall, a substitute for plaster, and the brick houses are plastered. All walls are painted and mottled with lead and oil in different tints and can be washed with soap and water. No wallpaper is used in any dwelling. The wood floors are treated with one coat of creosote stain, two coats of shellac and waxed, with the exception of the kitchens which have one coat of creosote stain and two coats of spar varnish. Heat is supplied by a furnace taking return air from the first floor and equipped with an automatic control of water pump. The hot-water tank is placed near the furnace and connected with a brass coil in the furnace. All houses are wired throughout for electricity, and have electric fixtures with combination fixtures in kitchen and bathroom. The front doors are connected with the kitchens by electric bells. The bathrooms are equipped with tub, lavatory, water closet, gas wall heater and medicine cabinet with mirror. Linoleum is laid on floors before fixtures are set.

In most of the six-room houses and all of the seven-room houses clothes chutes run from bathroom and kitchen to laundry and paper chutes from kitchen to cellar. On the first floor of all houses there is a coat closet and every bedroom has a closet, and there is a linen closet on the second floor. The bedrooms provide space for the usual furniture with two locations for the bed. Most of the six and seven-room houses have fireplaces for gas, wood or coal, while some have bookcases, buffets, French doors, window seats, etc. All kitchens are equipped with enameled iron sinks, built in cupboards, metal flour bins, etc., together with ample stove and table space.

Residence lots are sold only to employees of the Carnegie Steel Co. to persons necessary to the town of McDonald, either for cash or on a plan of equal monthly payments to suit the condition of the buyer, and providing that each lot be paid for at the end of thirty months, at which time a dwelling must have been

erected. Business lots are sold for cash or on payments, but a building must be erected within eighteen months. All lots are sold subject to certain building restrictions and a perpetual restriction against liquor. Residence lots have a special restriction providing for an easement across the rear end to permit repairs to sewers, water, gas, electric, or telephone service.

THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT FOR THE AMERICAN STEEL & WIRE CO., AT DONORA, PA.

*Location and town site.*—This development is situated in South Donora, about 40 miles outside of Pittsburgh, in an elevated position overlooking the plants and the Monongahela River on one side, and the open country and hillsides on the other. Upon this elevation 100 houses have been built for the use of the skilled and semiskilled workmen employed at the plant. Street-car lines are only within two blocks from the houses and the farthest plant is within 20 minutes' walk.

*Streets.*—The main street is 40 feet wide over all, property line to property line. This allows a 24-foot roadway from curb to curb, a 3-foot grass plot inside of curb and 5-foot concrete sidewalks on both sides of the street. Other streets are 18 feet wide from curb to curb, allowing a 5-foot 6-inch grass plot. All streets are paved with concrete.

*Alleyways.*—The alleyways are 10 feet wide laid in concrete, and beyond the pavement is a 2½-foot clearance line on each side to fence or other obstruction, leaving an alley practically 15 feet wide.

*Sewage, water and gas mains.*—The sanitary sewers were laid on both sides of the street between the curb and the sidewalk. This was done to avoid tearing up the streets to make sewer connections or for repairs. The storm sewers were laid in the street under the pavement, and catch basins were placed at convenient points. There is little likelihood that it will ever be necessary to reach the storm sewer and therefore it can be placed safely in the street under the pavement.

Mains were laid both for water and gas and connections made to within the property line and to the houses. These mains were laid in the street with standard branch connections for each house.

*Houses.*—In planning these houses care was exercised to meet the requirements of modern sanitary facilities, with the result that these houses are complete in every respect, including furnaces, electric lights, bathrooms, ranges, cupboards, window-shades, screens, swing hooks, etc.

Monolithic concrete construction, properly reinforced, was chosen because of its superior building and fireproof qualities. There is practically no danger of fire spreading from one house to another, as the only exposed framework on the exterior is in the window-sashes.

There are eight types of houses, consisting of four, five, and six room double and single houses. In all there are 20 double and 60 single houses, making 100 dwellings.

*Surroundings.*—The company sowed grass seeds on the lawns and planted trees and shrubbery. Other outside improvements, such as yard walks and steps, steel clothes posts, etc., were provided by the company to encourage the people to take pride in the appearance of their surroundings and keep them neat and attractive.

#### BOARDING HOUSES.

##### THE NENOVAN, MORGAN PARK.

The club consists of four independent buildings, located upon one tract of ground. The large building has 37 single-bed sleeping rooms, the others have 18, 11, and 8 single-sleeping rooms, respectively, or a total of 74.

The greater proportion of the bedrooms are 8 by 10, a few of them being larger and used as double bedrooms. Wash rooms are not provided therein, but provision is made on each floor for a general wash room with shower baths and individual lockers for toilet articles. One bath tub is provided in each building, and it is recognized that under certain circumstances of such a type of bath is necessary. One general toilet room is located on the second floor. To make the most of these small bedrooms, especially designed furniture has been provided. Each room is equipped with a three-quarter size bed, a combined wardrobe and chiffonier, a writing desk table, bedroom chair, towel rail, laundry bag, waste basket, beside rug and window curtains. The walls and ceilings are tinted with flat colors. The floors and woodwork are hard wood, mahogany finish. The cor-

ridors are of hard wood and carpeted, to render the premises as quiet as possible, as both day and night turn men occupy the rooms.

The largest of the four houses contains the common dining room and recreation room. The recreation room contains easy chairs, library tables, writing desks, magazine racks, card tables, piano and so forth. The dining room has a seating capacity of about 50 persons, which is ample for the 74 residents. The dining room also serves a number of nonresident guests and occasional visitors at all meal hours.

Each wash room contains two shower baths, individual articles for toilet articles (numbered to correspond with the room number), a dental basin, a drinking fountain, wash basins and urinal. The "flowing stream" washing fixtures have been provided. The floors of the wash rooms are of concrete, with concrete baseboards; and the walls are of cement plaster, finished in oil paint.

Each of the four houses is heated by hot air, direct system. Each room has an inlet and an outlet register, and the circulation in general can be controlled by a blower fan in combination with damper regulators in the main heating duct for each floor.

#### RIVERSIDE HALL, GARY.

To provide acceptable rooming and boarding accommodations for single men, the American Bridge Co., has erected a three-story building, in Gary, Ind., within two blocks of the main gate of their Gary plant.

The building is 120 feet 8 inches long, 76 feet wide, with three stories and a basement. The architecture is of Colonial type, with two wings, so arranged that direct light enters each room in the building. The exterior is finished in brick and stucco, with hydrostone foundations.

The property on which it is located is sufficiently large to afford a lawn on all sides of the building. Shade trees have been set out and groups of shrubbery planted around the building.

The basement contains the kitchen and dining room, boiler, trunk and storage rooms, and a large toilet room. The kitchen is equipped with all necessary appliances to serve 258 people—the seating capacity of the dining room. The dining room is light and cheerful, with a red tile floor, hydrostone walls and plastered ceiling. A toilet room adjoins the dining room, affording the men, as they come from the shop, opportunity to wash before they go into the dining room.

The first floor of the main building is 32 feet by 75 feet, and is arranged as a lobby. It has paneled walls and a beamed ceiling. There is a large open fireplace on one side, and all the furniture of the room is of substantial character, finished in fumed oak and arranged to give a homelike and inviting appearance.

Opening from the lobby is a large porch furnished with chairs and settees.

Three rooms in the southeast corner of the first floor have been arranged for the living quarters of the housekeeper. The remainder of the first floor and all of the second and third floors are given over to rooms for employees. Each floor has two sets of toilets, showers and wash rooms. There are 62 single rooms and 26 double rooms in the building, giving a total capacity of 114 people. Each room is furnished with single bed, chiffonier, rocking chair, writing table and chair and a steel locker. The washing arrangements conform to the regulations recommended by the sanitation committee of the United States Steel Corporation and are of the flowing stream type. No washing is done from a common bowl. In each toilet room are individual shaving stands, equipped with electric lights, reflectors and mirrors. A system of call bells is installed, enabling the clerk to signal the occupant of each room and the occupant to acknowledge the signal.

#### EDUCATIONAL WORK.

For many years the companies have been carrying on educational work among their employees, including vocational training and apprenticeship classes, and the teaching of English to foreigners. The purposes are:

To increase the efficiency of the workmen by teaching the fundamental and more advanced principles involved in their individual lines of work.

To increase the earning power of the pupils by guiding them along the paths of quicker and deeper reasoning which lead to positions of gradually increasing responsibility in all departments of the mill.

To promote and develop the happiness of the pupils not only in their daily work in the shops and mills but in their home life as well by opening the door to a more thorough understanding of the meaning of life and work.

The courses are varied to meet the needs of every employee who is desirous of advancement, whether he is the graduate of a university or a man who has had no special school advantages. The teachers are men actively engaged in their respective lines, either in the mills or in the city. These men are selected because of their scholarship and broad practical experience in the branches they teach. The majority are assistants or foremen in the various departments of the mills, and, therefore, are personally acquainted with many of the students in their classes, which results in an increased mutual benefit. Actual mill problems are considered and studied in each step of the work and they are taken up in the prescribed courses, with the result that each pupil not only learns the principles involved in his own special line of work, but also those that must be understood before he is qualified for the position ahead.

The subsidiary companies of the Steel Corporation have exerted their efforts to Americanize their foreign-born workers, and success is attending their efforts. The first step is the teaching of the English language. Classes are conducted by many of the companies either in the rooms of the mill buildings, or, through the cooperation of the local school authorities, in a school room on two or three evenings of each week. Frequently employees of the companies volunteer as teachers, and lessons begin with the pronunciation of names of the objects most familiar with the men in their daily work. These lessons are supplemented by posters and bulletins posted throughout the mills and mines of the companies. As their knowledge increases many of the men attend the local public night schools or Y. M. C. A. classes, which are partially maintained by the companies through contributions made at regular intervals; and when the course in English is completed many of the men are competent to take out first citizenship papers.

In one locality this Americanization work is carried on for the sole purpose of assisting the men to secure their naturalization papers. While the actual task is under the supervision of an Americanization committee, our subsidiary companies in the vicinity contribute freely to the maintenance of the schools and to the teaching staff. The buildings, light, heat and janitors' services are furnished by the school boards and everything possible is done to make the schools attractive to the foreigners. The men are taught to read and write, and to insure their interest in the lessons they are encouraged to discuss daily events and to read the newspapers. When they have acquired a sufficient knowledge of English, many of the men apply for first papers; and they receive instructions to fit them to pass the Government examinations for securing their final papers. Last year, in this locality alone, there were some 400 men enrolled in the various classes and in regular attendance at the schools. In another district the night school enrollment up to March 31, 1918, numbered 2,366.

Among the women and children much of the Americanization work is in the hands of the visiting nurses. The work covers a wide field; but through the children's clubs and home-making classes these nurses are given opportunities to inculcate American ideals in the minds of the boys and girls, and through them to reach the parents, who are glad and eager to learn from their American neighbors. At many of the practical housekeeping centers classes are formed for the foreign-born women, where they are taught the proper care of their children and homes. Here they acquire some familiarity with the language as well as a knowledge of American standards of living.

#### STOCK SUBSCRIPTION PLAN.

In 1903 there was inaugurated a plan under which shares of stock of the United States Steel Corporation were offered to all employees upon easy and especially favorable terms, which involve benefits beyond those to the ordinary stockholder. Its principal features are:

Number of shares which can be subscribed for depends upon the salary of the employee, but it is relatively greater for the lower-paid men. The price of the stock is the market price, or usually a little less. Payments: Minimum, \$2 per share per month. Maximum that can be paid is 25 per cent of monthly earnings. A premium of \$5 per annum for five years is paid on each share of



stock purchased by employees under this plan. Non-paid-up subscriptions may be canceled and the money paid in is refunded to the employee with 5 per cent interest. Premiums are not paid to employees who cancel their subscriptions, sell their stock or leave the employ of the company, and the forfeited or unpaid premiums for all these except cancellations are kept in a fund and divided pro rata among the remaining share holders under this plan at the end of the five-year period.

If death occurs to an employee who has subscribed for stock and made payments under this plan, his estate receives the unpaid premium for the full five-year period and a pro rata share of the premiums undivided at the time of death.

On December 31, 1918; more than 36,646 employees were stockholders under the plan. Their aggregate holdings amounted to more than 143,528 shares of stock. It is impossible to ascertain how many employees, in addition to those yet receiving the special benefits that continue for five years, hold stock upon which these special benefits have ceased to be paid, but it is believed that their numbers would greatly increase the figures here given.

The subscriptions for 1916, 1917, 1918, and 1919 were as follows:

*Number of employees subscribing.*

	1916	1917	1918	1919
Employees receiving less than \$800 per year.....	7,288	3,253	1,920	1,473
Employees receiving \$800 to \$2,500 per year.....	16,272	33,443	37,236	46,676
Employees receiving over \$2,500 per year.....	1,583	2,556	4,621	13,175
Total.....	25,143	39,252	43,777	61,324

*Number of shares of stock to Sept. 1.*

	1916	1917	1918	1919
Employees receiving less than \$800 per year.....	8,961	3,253	2,252	2,148
Employees receiving \$800 to \$2,500 per year.....	31,952	52,680	72,856	101,764
Employees receiving over \$2,500 per year.....	9,356	11,819	21,537	54,149
Total.....	50,269	67,752	96,645	158,061

The annual cost to the corporation of the employees' stock subscription plan is at the present time approximately \$1,400,000.

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,

*New York, January 2, 1919.*

*To the officers and employees of the United States Steel Corporation and of its subsidiary companies:*

The corporation again offers to those now actually in the employ of the corporation, or any of its subsidiaries, the opportunity to subscribe for shares of its common stock, not exceeding an aggregate total of 50,000 shares, under the following terms and conditions:.

First. All subscriptions shall be made upon the express condition and agreement that all questions concerning the said subscriptions, and the allotments and interests thereunder, shall be decided by the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation in its discretion and such decision shall be final and conclusive upon all parties.

Second. Subscriptions shall be for one or more shares of common stock at the subscription price of \$92 per share.

Third. The following table shows the maximum number of shares that may be subscribed for by employees whose salaries or wages are within the respective limits stated, but employees at their option may subscribe for less than such maximum number of shares.

*Subscriptions to common stock.*

Employees receiving annual salaries of--	May subscribe for a maximum number of--	Employees receiving annual salaries of--	May subscribe for a maximum number of--
	<i>Shares.</i>		<i>Shares.</i>
\$690 or less.....	1	\$3,740.01 to \$9,690.....	10
\$690.01 to \$1,533.33.....	2	\$9,690.01 to \$13,225.....	11
\$1,533.31 to \$2,146.66.....	3	\$13,225.01 to \$14,375.....	12
\$2,146.67 to \$3,450.....	4	\$14,375.01 to \$15,525.....	13
\$3,450.01 to \$4,216.66.....	5	\$15,525.01 to \$16,675.....	14
\$4,216.67 to \$1,983.33.....	6	\$16,675.01 to \$17,825.....	15
\$4,983.31 to \$6,900.....	7	\$17,825.01 to \$18,975.....	16
\$6,900.01 to \$7,820.....	8	\$18,975.01 to \$32,200.....	17
\$7,820.01 to \$3,740.....	9		

## PAYMENT FOR STOCK.

Fourth. Payment of subscriptions shall be in monthly installments to be deducted from the salary or wages of the subscriber. The first deduction will be made from March salary or wages. No installment shall be less than \$2 per share and shall not exceed one-quarter of any one month's salary or wages. Installments exceeding the minimum must be in even dollars. Payment for the stock must be completed within three years. Interest at 5 per cent per annum will be charged on deferred payments.

## DIVIDENDS.

Fifth. Until payment of the subscription has been completed, any dividends paid on the stock subscribed for will be credited to the account of the subscriber as part of his payment. After the stock is issued to the subscriber, future dividends will go direct to him.

## CANCELLATIONS—REFUND OF INSTALLMENTS.

Sixth. Subscriptions will be canceled for the following reasons:

- (1) By request of a subscriber.
- (2) By (a) voluntarily leaving the service, or (b) being discharged for cause; or (c) failing to resume employment when requested. (See sec. 11.)
- (3) By discontinuing payments without the consent of the corporation for three consecutive months.

The cancellation of a subscription forfeits all interest and benefits which the subscriber would have received if he had continued such subscription. There will then be returned to him the full amount of payments made on the subscription so canceled with interest at 5 per cent per annum, no credit being given him for dividends or for the special allowance referred to in third paragraph of section 7, and no interest being charged on deferred payments. A subscription may not be canceled in part.

## SPECIAL BENEFITS.

Seventh. When the stock is fully paid for, it will be issued in the name of the subscriber. He may sell his certificate, but as an inducement for him to keep it while he remains in the service the following offer is made, viz:

If he will keep the stock and in January of each year, for five years, commencing with January, 1920, will exhibit the certificate to the treasurer of his company, together with a statement from a proper official that he has been continuously in the employ of the corporation or of one or another of its subsidiary companies during the preceding year, and has shown a proper interest in its welfare and progress he will for each of such five years receive a cash payment at the rate of \$5 a share for each share of common stock.

Subscribers who may not have fully paid their subscriptions by January in any year, will, if their subscriptions are still in force, and they have otherwise fulfilled all the conditions of continuous and faithful service as provided, be

credited in their subscription accounts with the foregoing special allowance of \$5 per share on their subscriptions for common stock.

#### ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION.

Eighth. If a subscriber keeps his certificate and remains continuously in the service for five years, the corporation intends that he shall then receive a still further compensation, which can not now be ascertained or stated, but which will be derived from the following sources, viz:

The special allowances referred to in section 7, which, after a subscription is fully paid, are forfeited—

(a) Transfer of certificate from name of a subscriber, whether intentionally or otherwise;

(b) Voluntarily leaving the service, or being discharged for cause, or failing to resume employment when requested. (See sec. 11.)

will be paid by the corporation into a special fund at the end of each year. This fund will be credited with interest at 5 per cent per annum and at the end of the five years' period the total amount thus accumulated will be divided into as many parts as shall be equal to the number of shares of common stock subscribed for hereunder and then remaining in the hands of subscribers who shall have continued in such employ for the whole five years. The corporation will then by its own final determination in its discretion award to each subscriber whom it shall find deserving thereof as many parts of such accumulated funds as he shall be entitled to on basis of the number of shares then held by him under this plan.

#### DEATH OR PERMANENT DISABILITY.

Ninth. If a subscriber dies or is permanently disabled while rendering faithful service during such five years' period, payment will be made to his estate or to him, as follows:

(a) If his subscription is fully paid and he has received and not disposed of his certificate of stock the corporation will pay a sum equal to \$5 per share for each of the five years not then expired, and also a pro rata amount of the special fund arising from forfeitures, referred to in section 8 preceding, which may have accrued at the time of his death or disability.

(b) If his subscription has not been paid in full, the corporation will pay the money theretofore paid in by him on account, together with the dividends paid on the stock subscribed for, the special allowance for the entire five years' period and a pro rata share of the amount of the special fund mentioned, less interest at 5 per cent per annum on deferred installments.

(c) If at time of decease or permanent disablement the subscription has been fully paid but certificate not yet delivered, the corporation will turn over the certificate, as first stated above, together with the additional payments mentioned in paragraph (a) preceding.

#### PENSIONED EMPLOYEES.

A pensioner will not be permitted to subscribe, but any subscriber who is subsequently pensioned may continue payments on his subscription and when fully paid, he will receive the certificate for the stock subscribed for and the payments referred to in paragraph (a) of section 9, provided, however, that as soon as he shall have fully paid his subscription and received his certificate of stock, he will be treated as though permanently disabled and payments will be made to him in accordance with provisions of paragraph (a), section 9.

#### BENEFICIARY.

Tenth. A subscriber may name in his subscription as beneficiary the person to whom in the event of his death he desires the corporation to pay all amounts, in connection with his subscription, which would otherwise be payable to his estate. By written notice delivered to the treasurer of the company by which he is employed he may substitute another beneficiary. The corporation, upon satisfactory proof of death, will under the conditions of the subscription pay to such beneficiary all amounts in connection with the subscription which would otherwise be payable to the estate of the subscriber. When the beneficiary has been named the subscriber's estate shall have no

claim to any such amounts, unless the beneficiary should die before the subscriber, and in that event payment will be made to the subscriber's estate.

#### SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT.

Eleventh.—Subscribers whose employment has been suspended by reason of the temporary closing of a plant and who shall continue ready and willing when required to resume their service, will not be deprived of the special allowance of \$5 per share per year during such suspension, although they may have accepted employment during such suspension. As presumptive evidence of willingness to resume employment, the corporation will accept (1) from the holders of fully-paid subscriptions, the exhibition of the original certificate in January of each year, and (2) from the holders of partly-paid subscriptions the retention by them of their subscription during the preceding year.

The above period of suspension will not be counted as part of the three years limited for the full payment of the subscriptions, and during such suspension monthly payments will not be required, though if so desired by the employee they may be continued.

In case of the death during such suspension of any such subscribing and continuing employee, his estate or his beneficiary, will be entitled to the same benefits accruing to his subscription as if he had died while under employment.

Failure to present the original certificate as provided, or the withdrawal of a partly-paid subscription, or the failure to resume employment when requested, will constitute a relinquishment of all benefits referred to in this circular.

Twelfth. Subscriptions will be received until February 28, 1919, and allotment made as soon thereafter as possible.

Thirteenth. The foregoing offer is also made to former employees who left to undertake service connected with the war, provided they reenter the employment of the United States Steel Corporation or one of its subsidiary companies by July 1, 1919. The first deduction will be made from the wages of the month following their return.

By order of the Finance Committee,

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,  
RICHARD TRIMBLE, *Secretary*.

#### SUBSCRIPTION INSTRUCTIONS.

1. A new subscriber must sign full given name instead of initials. If given name appears to be a nickname, but subscriber insists that it is correct, the signature should be approved by one accepting the subscription. A subscription signed "his mark" must be witnessed. All subscription blanks are to be personally signed.

2. Former subscribers must sign to correspond with former subscriptions. John J. Jones should not sign as "J. J." or "J. Joseph."

3. Typewritten transcripts must agree exactly with autographs.

4. If subscriber holds other stock certificates, his subscription should be signed to correspond exactly with his other certificates.

5. The number of shares subscribed for as stated on the subscription blank must not be in excess of number shown in the table.

6. If a subscriber came from another department or another company, notice of the transfer should be sent promptly to the Stock Subscription Bureau.

7. The correct full given name and address of a beneficiary should be inserted. If the subscriber is related to the beneficiary, the relationship must be given.

8. It is hoped that subscribers will not change the amounts of installments unless absolutely necessary, and if changed, it is also hoped the new rate will be adhered to for all remaining payments.

#### COMMON STOCK.

To the United States Steel Corporation :

{	Dept.....
{	Sheet.....
{	Line.....
{	Ctf. No.....

Referring to, and upon the terms and conditions of, your circular letter, dated New York, January 2, 1919, I hereby subscribe, and will pay, at the price of \$92 per share for (—) shares of the common stock of the United States Steel Corporation, carrying all dividends payable after the date of this subscription,

subject to the understanding that there may be allotted to me all or any part of my subscription.

I hereby agree to pay such price by allowing the deduction or retention thereof out of my monthly salary or wages; and accordingly, for the purpose of making such payment, I authorize the treasurer of the company by which I am employed to deduct and to retain, and to apply in payment for such common stock, the sum of \$----- per month out of my wages or salary, until I give written notice to the contrary, hereby reserving the right to increase or to decrease the amount of such monthly payment at my pleasure within the limits stated in said communication. Please issue certificate in same name as certificates have been issued to me on my former subscription, if any.

In accordance with section 10 of said circular letter of January 2, 1919, I hereby designate my----- residing at----- as the  
(Relationship.)

person to whom, in the event of my death, I desire the corporation to pay all amounts in connection with my subscription which would otherwise be payable to my estate.

I am now in the service of----- company, at its works at----- and I now receive in each year a salary or wages amounting to \$-----

Dated, January -----, 1919.

Signature-----

First name in full.

Typewritten copy of signature-----

Dividend mailing address-----

NOTE.—To avoid errors, a typewritten or hand-printed copy of the subscriber's signature must appear on the subscription blank under such signature, in the same form as the signature.

Tear off and hand to paymaster.

#### MEMORANDUM OF SUBSCRIPTION TO 1919 COMMON STOCK OF UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

Date -----

Price of stock----- Signature-----

Shares subscribed----- Address-----

Certificate No. T-----

Yearly salary----- Subscription canceled-----

Subscription paid in full-----

Monthly installment-----

Beneficiary-----

Installments paid:

1919—March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December.

1920—January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December.

1921—January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December.

#### UNITED STATES STEEL AND CARNEGIE PENSION FUND.

The United States Steel and Carnegie pension fund was established in the year 1910, by the joint action of the corporation and Mr. Andrew Carnegie. Its purpose is the payment to employees of old-age pensions from the income of the fund. For this purpose, the corporation provided \$8,000,000 which, with the Carnegie relief fund of \$4,000,000, created by Mr. Andrew Carnegie on March 12, 1901, makes a joint fund of \$12,000,000. This fund is administered by a board of 12 trustees through a manager appointed by the board.

Its principal features are:

(a) Compulsory retirement for men at 70 years of age and for women at 60 years of age, after 25 years of service.

(b) Retirement at request of the employee or his employing officer after the age of 65 for men and 55 for women, after 25 years of service.

(c) Retirement by reason of permanent total incapacity, after 15 years of service.

(d) Pension basis: For each year of service, 1 per cent of the average monthly earnings for the last 10 years of service.

(c) Credit for service rendered to any of the plants of the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation or to the predecessors of such companies.

(f) Minimum pension, \$12 per month; maximum pension, \$100 per month.

#### REPORT FOR THE YEAR OF 1918.

The records of the plan on December 31, 1918, are as follows:

Total number of pensioners December 31, 1918, 2,861.

Number of pensions granted during 1918, 201.

Total amount of pensions paid during 1918, \$709,059.82.

Average age at which pensions were granted to retiring employees since the inauguration of the plan is 63.64.

Average term of service rendered by such pensioners is 28.93.

Average pension granted (monthly), \$21.20.

#### UNITED STATES STEEL AND CARNEGIE PENSION FUND.

Pension rules taking effect January 1, 1911; amended January 1, 1913, April 1, 1915, and December 14, 1917.

United States Steel and Carnegie Pension Fund Directors: A. F. Banks, Chicago, Ill.; W. W. Blackburn, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Raynal C. Bolling, New York, N. Y.; H. P. Bope, Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. J. Buffington, Chicago, Ill.; D. M. Clemson, Pittsburgh, Pa.; W. H. Clingerman, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Geo. G. Crawford, Birmingham, Ala.; James A. Farrell, New York, N. Y.; W. J. Filbert, New York, N. Y.; R. A. Franks, New York, N. Y.; E. H. Gary, New York, N. Y.; D. G. Kerr, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Thomas Morrison, Pittsburgh, Pa.; W. C. McCausland, Pittsburgh, Pa.; W. J. Olcott, Duluth, Minn.; Wm. P. Palmer, Cleveland, Ohio; E. W. Pargny, Pittsburgh, Pa.; J. H. Reed, Pittsburgh, Pa.; W. B. Schiller, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Charles L. Taylor, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Richard Trimble, New York, N. Y.; H. D. Williams, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Aug. Ziesing, Chicago, Ill.

Finance Committee: E. H. Gary, Chairman, W. J. Filbert, R. A. Franks, J. H. Reed, Chas. L. Taylor.

Pension Committee: Raynal C. Bolling, chairman, M. H. Reed, Charles L. Taylor.

General Executive Officers: E. H. Gary, president, New York, N. Y.; Charles L. Taylor, vice president, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Raynal C. Bolling, secretary, New York, N. Y.; R. A. Franks, treasurer, New York, N. Y.; J. B. Erkin, manager, J. H. Wood, assistant manager, Oliver Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The United States Steel and Carnegie Pension Fund was established in the year 1910 by the joint action of the United States Steel Corporation and Andrew Carnegie and began operations on January 1, 1911. Its purpose is the payment of old age pensions to employees. These pensions are paid from the income of a joint fund, toward which the United States Steel Corporation provided \$8,000,000 and Andrew Carnegie provided \$4,000,000 by the Carnegie Relief Fund originally created March 12, 1901. This pension fund is administered by a board of directors, through a manager appointed by the board.

#### PENSION RULES—WHO MAY OBTAIN PENSIONS.

1. Employees of the United States Steel Corporation or of any other corporation a majority of whose capital stock is owned or controlled by the United States Steel Corporation, or of the board of directors of this pension fund, may obtain pensions under the following conditions:

##### *First. Pensions by compulsory retirement.*

2. All men who have been twenty-five (25) years or longer in the service and have reached the age of seventy (70) years shall be retired and pensioned.

3. All women who have been twenty-five years or longer in the service and have reached the age of sixty (60) years shall be retired and pensioned.

4. At the request of their employing officers persons employed in executive or administrative positions may be allowed to continue in active service after reaching the ages mentioned above.

*Second. Pensions.*

5. Any man who has been 25 years in mines, railroads, shops, and other works, the age of 65 years may be retired and by the board of directors at its request of his employing officer.

6. Any woman who has been 25 years or longer for the administration of this the age of 55 years may be retired and pensioned January, 1911.

*Third. Pensions for permanent incapacity with the request of workers in the steel*

7. Any employee who has been 15 years or longer in the able to make become permanently totally incapacitated through no fault of his or I suggest of sickness or injuries may be pensioned at the discretion of the continued rector.

AMOUNT OF PENSIONS.

8. The monthly pensions to be paid will be made up on the following basis, subject to the provisions of rule 27:

For each year of service 1 per cent of the average monthly pay received during the last 10 years of service.

Illustration.—An employee who has been 25 years in the service and has received an average monthly pay of \$60 will receive a pension of 25 per cent of \$60, or \$15 a month.

9. No pension granted shall be more than \$100 a month or less than \$12 a month.

HOW TO OBTAIN PENSIONS.—PENSIONS BY COMPULSORY RETIREMENT.

10. Employing officers will make prompt report to the manager of the fund of every man who has been 25 years or longer in the service and has reached the age of 70 years, and of every woman who has been 25 years or longer in the service and has reached the age of 60 years. These reports will be sent to the president of the company concerned for his approval.

PENSIONS BY RETIREMENT AT REQUEST.

11. Any man who has been 25 years or longer in the service and has reached the age of 65 years, and any woman who has been 25 years or longer in the service and has reached the age of 55 years who wishes to be retired and pensioned should notify his or her employing officer.

12. Any employing officer who wishes to retire an employee who has reached the age and has the length of service fixed for retirement at request, must notify such employee and report to the manager of the fund the request that such employee be retired and pensioned. These requests, whether from an employee or an employing officer, will be sent to the president of the company concerned for his approval.

PENSIONS FOR PERMANENT INCAPACITY.

13. Any employee who has served 15 years, and who is permanently totally incapacitated through no fault of his own as a result of sickness or injuries, may notify his employing officer and apply for a pension. Every such application will be sent by the employing officer to the president of the company concerned for his approval. In every such case it must be shown to the satisfaction of the board of directors by physical examination that the employee applying for a pension is permanently totally incapacitated to continue in the service.

GENERAL REGULATIONS.

14. Pensions from the fund will be paid only to those employees who have given their entire time to the service of corporations included under the provisions of the fund.

15. The acceptance of a pension from the fund shall not bar any retired employee from engaging in other business so long as such other business is not of the same character as the former employment. No employee receiving a pension may reenter the service.

(c) Credit for service rendered to any companies of the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries.

(f) Minimum pension, \$12 per year.

The records of the  
Total number of  
Number of years  
Total amount paid  
Average annual  
inauguration of the  
service and has  
as a result  
of di-

RECEIVED

or longer in the service and has reached  
or either at his request or at  
her request or at

283

OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

since which the employee when retired, and in which shall not be counted; if a leave of absence or suspension on account of reduction of force shall not be deducted in reckoning the service, or exceeding the prescribed limitations, ten years, shall not be counted the time thus lost shall be

lost from and after April 1, 1936 (except in seasonal occupations) credit for previous service if less than six months on account of lay-off; provided however, that employees shall be paid for previous service until termination of service is payable, if such employees who voluntarily resign the service shall be reemployed within six months. The board shall fix the date upon which the

19. The pension shall be paid from the fund.

Pensions shall not be paid from any relief fund operated by the United States Steel Corporation or any subsidiary company, nor for time in which the death of the retired employee occurs.

20. Pensions shall be paid at the close of each month, unless revoked by the board, and shall terminate with the payment for the month succeeding that in which the death of the retired employee occurs.

21. Whenever the terms "service" and "in the service" are used in these rules, they mean employment by the United States Steel Corporation, by one or more corporations a majority of whose stock is owned or controlled by the United States Steel Corporation, by their predecessors, or by the board of directors of this fund.

22. Pensions may be withheld or terminated in case of misconduct on the part of the beneficiaries, or for other cause sufficient in the judgment of the board of directors to warrant such action.

23. In order that direct personal relations with retired employees may be preserved and that such employees may continue to enjoy the benefits of pensions granted them, no assignment of pensions will be permitted or recognized under any circumstances; neither shall pensions be subject to attachment or other legal process for debts of the beneficiaries.

24. This pension plan is a purely voluntary provision for the benefit of employees superannuated or totally incapacitated after long and faithful service, and constitutes no contract and confers no legal rights upon any employee.

25. The manager of the fund shall decide all questions arising out of the administration of the fund and relating to employees, subject to a right of appeal to the board of directors within 30 days after notice to the persons interested of the manager's decision. The action of the board of directors or of any committee designated by the board to hear such appeals shall be final and conclusive.

26. Neither the creation of this fund nor any other action at any time taken by the board of directors shall give to any employee a right to be retained in the service, and all employees remain subject to discharge to the same extent as if this pension fund had never been created.

27. Whenever it may be found that the basis named for pensions shall create total demands in excess of the annual income increased by any surplus deemed applicable by the board of directors, a new basis may be adopted reducing the pensions theretofore or thereafter granted so as to bring the total expenditures within the limitations fixed by the board of directors. Notice of such new basis shall be given before the beginning of the year in which it may be decided to put the same into effect.

28. An annual report giving an account of the fund and its administration will be made as soon after the first of each year as practicable, and copies of such



report will be posted at all mills, mines, railroads, shops, and other works, and published by the board of directors.

29. These pension rules may be changed by the board of directors at its discretion.

By order of the board of directors, these rules for the administration of this fund shall apply to those in the service on or after January, 1911.

Mr. LINDABURY. Mr. Chairman, in compliance with the request of the committee, we have asked that some of the workers in the steel mills be sent on to testify, so that the committee might be able to make such inquiries of them as they choose. They are here and I suggest that we now call them and let Judge Gary's testimony be continued afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

**STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM RUMBERGER, MILL ROLLER AT  
STEEL WORKS AT NEWCASTLE, PA.**

The CHAIRMAN. Does this man have to have an interpreter?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

Mr. LINDABURY. He is one of the mill men at New Castle, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. State your business, Mr. Rumberger.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Mill roller at the steel works at New Castle, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. You are one of the rollers?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what mill?

Mr. RUMBERGER. New Castle.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the mills of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. RUMBERGER. It is the New Castle mill of the Carnegie Steel Co.; that is what it is known as.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many are employed there?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Really I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately how many?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I think about 1,900 or 2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And are any of them out on this strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. There is a strike on there, and there is quite a number of apprentice men I believe went out on the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there out on the strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Really I could not tell.

The CHAIRMAN. Well are there 20, or 30, or 40, or 50 per cent, or what?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I might imagine that probably it would be about 15 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. About 15 per cent you imagine?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you what is termed a union man?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you belong to the union?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you know about how many of the employees in that mill belong to the union?

Mr. RUMBERGER. In the working part of the mill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, in our department there was not any that belonged to it, only a few of the laborers, as far as I can understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The laborers are what we are talking about. How many of those belong to the union?

Mr. RUMBERGER. The foreigners belong.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. RUMBERGER. The foreigners belong.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of them are foreigners—

Mr. RUMBERGER (interrupting). There are no Americans on strike at all in our department.

Senator McKELLAR. What proportion of the 1,900 that work in that mill are foreigners?

Mr. RUMBERGER. What proportion are foreigners?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes. How many out of the 1,900 are foreigners?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, I would not be in a position to say, except only in my own department, where I work. I would say—

Senator McKELLAR. Well, about how many?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Oh, I suppose 30 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. About 30 per cent?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, that is just a rough estimate. It may be 10 per cent; I don't know. That was just my idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean the men—what do you mean by foreigners? Do you mean the men who are not naturalized?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir; that is what I would mean.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the men who are not citizens?

Mr. RUMBERGER. That is what I would mean.

The CHAIRMAN. And the nearest estimate you can give us as to their number is from 10 to 30 per cent?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, I would say about 15 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. And what nationalities are there working there?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Oh, Austrians and Slavish, and some Italians.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they speak the English language, this 15 per cent that you refer to?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, some of them do and some do not. With the most of them you can understand them.

The CHAIRMAN. And how are your orders given to them?

Mr. RUMBERGER. How?

The CHAIRMAN. How are your orders given to these men?

Mr. RUMBERGER. To these foreigners?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, they can understand what you want when you want them to do anything, but in conversation it is a pretty hard matter to understand some of them, but most of them understand what you say to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any Russians in your department?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Really, I could not tell how many nationalities are there.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any foreign papers circulated there? that is, papers printed in foreign languages?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I did not quite catch that.

The CHAIRMAN. I say, are there any papers circulated there that are printed in foreign languages?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, I see some of the foreigners have them, but they are not circulated generally.

Mr. LINDABURY. He means newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. Newspapers.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes. I have seen them, but they are not circulated generally.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you are one of the men receiving these high wages, \$32 a day, aren't you?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much do you receive?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I get \$156 a month and tonnage for the steel rolled.

Senator McKELLAR. \$156 a month and what?

Mr. RUMBERGER. And a tonnage; that is, a certain amount per ton for what I roll.

The CHAIRMAN. And how much do you get per ton?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Ninety-two cents per hundred tons.

The CHAIRMAN. And how much does that average per month?

Mr. RUMBERGER. About \$300.

Senator McKELLAR. That is \$156 a month and about \$144 added together, making \$300?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, my earnings last year was \$3,000, just a fraction over, not a dollar over.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you pay any one to help you out of those wages?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all yours?

Mr. RUMBERGER. That is all mine.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a married man, are you?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have a family, have you?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you own your own home?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I did own it, but I sold it. I have the price yet, though.

The CHAIRMAN. And do many of these men working in the mills own their own home?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, most of them do; most of the American people do, that I am acquainted with.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the company own any buildings and rent them to their men?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And is there any such thing as company stores?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Not that I know anything about.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many hours a day do you work?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Eight.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you ever been out on a strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When?

Mr. RUMBERGER. 1911—1901, I should say.

The CHAIRMAN. 1901?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you went out on that strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you leave the union?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No; the union left us.

The CHAIRMAN. They left you?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you went back to work?

Mr. RUMBERGER. And I went back to work. We went out on a sympathetic strike at the time of the tin, sheet and tool—what was that—sheet and tin people struck. We had signed our contract, and were working and the tin people had not signed up yet, and they had some trouble, and later on they called us out on a sympathetic strike. We went out, and when they signed their contract, or made some settlement—I do not remember just what it was—and they went to work and left us out. Our management then posted a notice to the effect that we could come to work by making personal applications for jobs with an open shop. We took the matter up with the tin people and said to them, "You called us out on a sympathetic strike. What are we going to do?" They said, "Get out of it the best way you can." Later on, on Saturday evening, I think it was, we got a telegram from the national headquarters that the strike was off and that ended the amalgamated union business.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many men are out on strike at that place now?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there a strike there—

Mr. RUMBERGER. None from my department. Following the walkout they had some trouble, I know, but I did not see it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the State constabulary doing up there about it?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, I have seen them patrolling the streets. That is about the only thing I have seen them doing.

The CHAIRMAN. What have you to say about the conditions that obtain there at the mill?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, the conditions could not be better, as I see them.

The CHAIRMAN. They could not be better?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I do not think they could; I do not see any room for improvement.

Senator McKELLAR. Speak a little louder.

Mr. RUMBERGER. I say I do not see any room for improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. What about recreation; have they recreation there?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes; they have playgrounds there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do women work in any of those mills?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No women?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No women. They have women in the offices, but they have no women in the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the kind of homes that the men live in?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, they all have pretty comfortable homes.

The CHAIRMAN. They all do?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the saving of money; do you know anything about that?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, yes; the men that have been working there for a number of years have saved money. I heard the remark made the other day that most of them had their own homes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these people whom you call foreigners—you said that you had foreigners there—do they save their money in order to go back to the old country?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, in the work, those that work under me, there is one man—there are two of them there—and one has taken out his first papers, and I do not think the other one has, and they have their families here, and they claim that they did not belong to the union and they did not come to work, and the reason they did not come to work—they are working now—the reason they did not come to work was that they were intimidated by the others and were afraid to go to work, and they came to work as soon as they thought it was safe.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about this question of intimidating workers?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Only what I have heard; no personal knowledge; only what I have heard in a general way.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you hear the men talk about this strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. There is a good bit of talk in the mill and in the city there.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the general talk as to what the strike is about?

Mr. RUMBERGER. They don't seem to be in sympathy with it.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "they," whom do you mean?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Every person I have talked with. I haven't talked to any person who has been in sympathy with it, either in or out of the mill.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you talked with any of the men who have struck?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever talked with them about their grievances?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I never have.

The CHAIRMAN. Or their long hours of work?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I never have.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard any complaints of that kind?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, I haven't.

The CHAIRMAN. Or complaints about their pay?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Or complaints of not being permitted to join unions?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I never heard of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any effort made to keep men from joining the union?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Not that I know of.

Senator MCKELLAR. What did they strike for?

Mr. RUMBERGER. That is what I would like to know; I don't know.

Senator MCKELLAR. What do they say they struck for?

Mr. RUMBERGER. They never explained to me; I never was approached and never met a man in my mill that had been approached.

Senator PHIPPS. Was there any vote taken as to whether or not this plant should go on strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Not that I know of. I don't think it would be possible to organize the mill, that is, as a whole, that is, the English-speaking people.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the organizers have meetings there and address meetings or is that permitted?

Mr. RUMBERGER. It has never been attempted as far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. Complaint has been made that these meetings were stopped.

Mr. RUMBERGER. I never heard of it.

The CHAIRMAN. That they were not permitting these meetings to go on, that they were denied the right of free speech.

Mr. RUMBERGER. I understand they had meetings uptown, but I don't know anything about it. I don't think they were ever prevented from holding any of their meetings; I never heard of it if they were.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether there was any propaganda of Bolshevism among those foreigners?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Among those, personally, individually?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Repeat that question, please.

The CHAIRMAN. I am asking you if you know of any propaganda among these foreigners working there to promote the doctrine of Bolshevism?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did all those men subscribe during the war for Liberty bonds and to the Red Cross?

Mr. RUMBERGER. They all did as far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. These men that struck?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, I would say all of them; I would venture to say all of them, as far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. You speak of Austrians; did you have any Austrians working there during the war?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I don't know. I call them hunkies, that is all I know. That is a general term for the foreigners there.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you call them?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Hunkies. I don't know one from another.

The CHAIRMAN. How did all these foreigners get in there among the men?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I suppose they were employed like everybody else. What means were used to bring them there I don't know. I have seen men at the employment office. They make applications for positions, and they are taken up, I guess, in rotation.

The CHAIRMAN. You think conditions there are all right, and that there is nothing to complain about?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I don't find anything, and I don't hear of anybody else making complaints.

The CHAIRMAN. If you have any complaints, to whom do you go?

Mr. RUMBERGER. The superintendent.

The CHAIRMAN. The superintendent?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Or my foreman, if it is a matter he has to look after. I go to my mill superintendent, and if he can not adjust the affair I go to our general superintendent.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you think the issue in this strike is?

Mr. RUMBERGER. As far as I can see, in my estimation, it is a foreign strike, and it would seem as though the matter of wages is not considered, but it is more of a recognition, from the foreign element.

The CHAIRMAN. Have any of those you term Americans gone out on strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. None in my mill have gone out.

The CHAIRMAN. None at all?

Mr. RUMBERGER. None at all, as far as I have inquired and as far as I can find out. I don't know of one American; that is, American born, out on strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any intimidation of the men who go out on a strike by what they call the Cossacks, the State constabulary.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, it is among themselves, as far as I can understand. Those who want to stay on a strike threaten those who want to work, and, of course, then they are afraid to go in the mill on account of violence when they come out of the mill again.

The CHAIRMAN. Have many men in the mills been armed?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I was.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any others?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Quite a few.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you built stockades or barbed wire?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you deputized in any way?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what way?

Mr. RUMBERGER. By the sheriff of the county.

The CHAIRMAN. What are you—a deputy sheriff?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I was sworn in as a deputy, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long have you been a deputy?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I was sworn in, I don't remember what day it was, I could not give you the date.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it been a month or so?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No; only at the time of this uprising. I would not say now, but I think it was on the Monday of that trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you receive any compensation from the State for acting as deputy sheriff?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You go right along on the pay roll just the same?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I am working every day.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you receive any more pay for being a deputy?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there of that kind in the mill?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Deputies?

The CHAIRMAN. Deputies on the pay roll of the company.

Mr. RUMBERGER. I could not tell; I imagine—I would not venture to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us an idea.

Mr. RUMBERGER. I suppose there are a hundred that have been deputized.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are armed?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, I don't know; I know I was.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any trouble?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, sir; I have never been approached by any person.

The CHAIRMAN. Have there been any incendiary speeches by strikers?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. They have been peaceful, too, have they?

Mr. RUMBERGER. With the exception of stopping men going to and from work; there is a lot of them that have been stopped before they got the sheriff. We were deputized for the protection of the company's property. Our men don't do any patrol duty only inside the company's property.

Senator McKELLAR. How many men were at work there yesterday?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yesterday, well, the day I worked, the night before last, I worked from 8 o'clock in the morning, and our turn was on full, every person was there.

The CHAIRMAN. Every person was there?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Take the whole shop of 1,900 employees. About how many, if you can estimate?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I would say as to these positions in the mill that were necessary for the operation of the mill, that they were all filled. As to the outside labor, I could not tell you about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Very few men were on strike then yesterday at New Castle?

Mr. RUMBERGER. All the positions were filled; that is, all the old men had not left work. That is, positions in my department. But outside, I could not tell you. The department I work in was filled up with the old regular men.

Mr. LINDABURY. I think this man was president of his union. Will you ascertain if that is so, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, I was at one time, when the union was recognized there and was working at one time; I was the local president.

Senator McKELLAR. You say your day is an eight-hour day?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there any men that work more than eight hours?

Mr. RUMBERGER. How is that?

Senator McKELLAR. I say what is the average work day in your shop?

Mr. RUMBERGER. The average work?

Senator McKELLAR. What is the average day's work?

Mr. RUMBERGER. A day's wages or work?

Senator McKELLAR. A day's work.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Eight hours.

Senator McKELLAR. Do none of them work over eight hours?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Oh, yes, there are some positions there—you take the mill wrights and the laborers and those fellows, and some work 10 hours and some 12.

Senator McKELLAR. And they get paid on an eight-hour day?

Mr. RUMBERGER. They get paid an eight-hour day and all over eight hours they get time and half time. If they work 10 hours they get 11 hours' pay.

Senator McKELLAR. About how many of them are there who work overtime?



Mr. RUMBERGER. I could not answer that.

Senator McKELLAR. What proportion of your laborers, just a small proportion?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Just a small proportion of our mill is working eight hours.

Senator McKELLAR. Taking the whole mill of 1,900, there is only a small proportion?

Mr. RUMBERGER. A very small proportion. The great proportion work eight hours in our mill.

Senator McKELLAR. The great body of them—

Mr. RUMBERGER. The main body works 10 and 12.

Senator McKELLAR. It was complained here the other day that they were worked in shifts 14 days each, and on the fourteenth day the men were forced to work 24 hours in some departments. Is that correct or not?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Not in my department.

Senator McKELLAR. Not in your department.

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, the men only worked six days a week. I heard the men complaining during the war that they worked seven days a week. Previous to that they only worked six days. A few worked on Sunday, and would have one day off during the week, and it was compulsory; but after the war came on the men worked straight seven days; and I hear a good many complaining now they do not get that straight seven days a week.

Senator McKELLAR. They work in the furnaces seven days a week, but in the other departments only six days. Is that correct?

Mr. RUMBERGER. In the other departments?

Mr. REID. I think that is correct; they work on Sundays to make the seven days.

Mr. RUMBERGER. You take our plant, repairmen, such as that, they work on Sunday but take a day off during the week.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, even furnace men work only six days a week?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I do not know. We have a man here who can explain that.

Senator WALSH. I understood you to say you were president of a labor union.

Mr. RUMBERGER. At one time I was.

Senator WALSH. While you were in the employ of this corporation?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No; I think then—[consulting a person in the audience].

Senator WALSH. Can you not answer that without advice?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Not in the United States Steel. I just asked him for information, whether it was under the National or Shendoah Valley. I do not remember which.

Senator WALSH. How many years ago was it you were president of a union?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Several years; three or four or five years, probably; before we was disorganized.

Senator WALSH. So in all probability you have not been connected with a union or have not been an officer in the union since the United States Steel Corporation took control over where you are now working?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No sir.

Senator WALSH. And I understand you to say you have been sworn in as a deputy?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Were you given a revolver by the public officials, or did you buy it and take it yourself?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I used my own revolver.

Senator WALSH. What public official, if any, has given you instructions as to what your duties as a deputy sheriff or acting deputy should be?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Why, the sheriff and his attorney gave his instructions.

Senator WALSH. So you were called together to get instructions?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. How many were present when these instructions were given?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I would say a hundred.

Senator WALSH. And you were advised to get a revolver, all of you?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No.

Senator WALSH. That was entirely voluntary, was it?

Mr. RUMBERGER. That was entirely voluntary.

Senator WALSH. I understand you have performed no duties as a deputy sheriff?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I have not.

Senator WALSH. You have continued in your employment for the Steel Corporation?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And simply have in your pocket a revolver, and have been instructed as to what you should do in case of a disturbance or outbreak. Is that right?

Mr. RUMBERGER. We never had any instructions in regards of firearms at all; but we had our instructions as to the duties of deputies in suppressing any riot or wrong.

Senator WALSH. Have you been given any instructions as a deputy as to when and under what circumstances you can use a revolver?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Well, the sheriff gave us those instructions.

Senator WALSH. He did? I thought you said you did not get any instructions—

Mr. RUMBERGER (interposing). From the sheriff, that is, when we were sworn in, we got instructions then, but you said from the officials of the company.

Senator WALSH. I mean public officials.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Oh, yes; we got instructions.

Senator WALSH. You have been instructed as to when and under what circumstances you could use a revolver?

Mr. RUMBERGER. He said only in extreme cases; he said a time probably would be necessary, but only in extreme cases.

Senator WALSH. Up to the present time you have not had to perform any duties as a deputy?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I have not.

Senator WALSH. Or anybody else?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Some of the fellows sworn in have been doing duty at the gates, different entrances to the mills.

Senator WALSH. During the day and night?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir; some of them have been there.

Senator McKELLAR. Have there been any outbreaks in your town at all?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Outbreaks?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. RUMBERGER. There were last Sunday night a week ago.

Senator McKELLAR. Were there any killed or injured?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I think there were some injured, and I think probably two of them died from the injuries received—I heard.

Senator McKELLAR. Who was hurt? One of the strikers?

Mr. RUMBERGER. A policeman was stabbed by a striker and one who was hit by a stone, I believe, and then some of the strikers who were shot by the deputies who were there at that time. I believe they were city; they were not any of the men from the mills there; they were deputies sworn in in the town there, and city police. This man stabbed was a city policeman.

Senator McKELLAR. The riot or fight took place uptown?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No; at one of the entrances to the mill.

Senator McKELLAR. What brought it about?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Only hearsay—I did not see it; only that I believe they tried to prevent some one from coming into the mill. These strikers have pickets out there, and got to throwing stones, and then some fellow shot and that started the thing, and some way—really, I could not give you the straight version of it, because I am not familiar with it. There was fellows there that saw it.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there anyone here that is familiar with that; that could tell us about it?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Now, I do not know unless Mr. Martin, who was there in the same works.

Mr. LINDABURY. Speak a little louder.

Mr. RUMBERGER. I could not tell you, only I heard newspaper talk, and I hear so many conflicting stories it is pretty hard——

Senator McKELLAR. What I am asking you is, did any gentleman come along with your party who could tell us about it.

Mr. RUMBERGER. No; I do not believe there is.

Senator McKELLAR. And what you know is only from hearsay.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir; hearsay.

Senator McKELLAR. There was an outbreak, in which several men were injured, and afterwards one or two of them died?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes; I believe so. I do not think there was any person killed outright. I do not know, I am sure.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you have any idea of what percentage of the employees in that particular mill are naturalized, of the foreign employees, are naturalized Americans, and which are not?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Not a very large per cent, just a small per cent, I imagine. I hear some of them talking there on it, and once in a while you hear them speaking about one taking out papers. That is not very often.

Senator McKELLAR. These foreigners have not come in very rapidly of late, have they, on account of the war?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No; we have not had any new ones there.

Senator McKELLAR. You have the same you had four or five years ago?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes; I see the same faces there I have seen for six or seven years.

Senator McKELLAR. And when they come in now they do not come in from abroad, but come in from other mills?

Mr. RUMBERGER. It seems that way; yes.

Senator McKELLAR. How is that?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I think that is so, just circulating from one mill to the other.

Senator McKELLAR. And very few of them become naturalized Americans?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I would say a small percentage, as far as I know of.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they send their earnings back to Europe?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I am told they do.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they take them back and stay awhile?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Some of them go back and stay awhile and then return here. Quite a number of them do that. I have known some of them to go back and forth as many as two or three times.

Senator McKELLAR. How do they keep their money, their savings?

Mr. RUMBERGER. An Austrian there has a bank, at least that is where these foreigners all do business, an Italian and an Austrian—they transact most of their business through these banks.

Senator McKELLAR. Private banks?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. I should like to be clear on your answer to one question, your reply to a question that Senator Walsh propounded. I understood it to mean that you have had no official connection with any labor union since the Steel Corporation acquired control of the plant in which you are employed; but, in answer to an earlier question, I believe you stated that you were president of a union at the time of the sympathetic strike?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, I did not say that. I said it was two or three years before we was disorganized that I was its officer, its presiding officer, two or three years previous to that, and that was 1901.

Senator PHIPPS. That answers my question.

Mr. RUMBERGER. I was a member, though, of the organization at that time; not in an official capacity, though.

Senator PHIPPS. You were a member in 1901 when the strike was called as a sympathetic strike.

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you rifles there in the mill ready for emergencies?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I see them at the gates there. They have guns, firearms, shotguns.

The CHAIRMAN. A good many of them?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, quite a few there. Those deputies have them, I guess whatever amount of deputies that are there, they have a gun for each one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they rifles or just revolvers?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Just whatever a man happens to have, I guess.

The CHAIRMAN. Are not any of them furnished to them? Does the company furnish any of these arms?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I do not know. A fellow asked me in regard to a gun; said he did not have any gun and wanted to borrow a gun.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you tell him where he could borrow a gun?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I told him I had one, but I would not loan it.

Senator WALSH. You mean by "gun" a revolver?

Mr. RUMBERGER. No, it was a gun; a shotgun was what he wanted.

Senator WALSH. Oh, shotgun.

Mr. LINDABURY. They are called riot guns.

The CHAIRMAN. Riot guns? What is a riot gun?

Mr. RUMBERGER. The same thing as any other gun, only a shorter gun; it don't shoot so far.

The CHAIRMAN. And it scatters more?

Mr. RUMBERGER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. The ends are cut off.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got any of those guns there?

Mr. RUMBERGER. I saw quite a few of them there.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. JAMES SINCLAIR, OF DUQUESNE, PA.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sinclair, what is your business?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am a heater.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in that mill?

Mr. SINCLAIR. About 28 years.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed there?

Mr. SINCLAIR. As near as I know about 5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the name of the mill?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The Duquesne Steel Works.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of those men are foreigners?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I could not give you the percentage of foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they foreigners?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh, yes, quite a few; a large percentage of them.

The CHAIRMAN. A large percentage?

Mr. SINCLAIR. A large percentage of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean more than 50 per cent?

Mr. SINCLAIR. There is at least 50 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean by "the foreigners," naturalized citizens or those who are not naturalized?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We have quite a lot of foreigners who are naturalized citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. You call those foreigners?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They are foreign-speaking tongues.

Senator WALSH. All those who do not speak the English language you call foreigners?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is what I meant when I made that remark.

The CHAIRMAN. Then over 50 per cent do not speak the English language. Is that what you mean?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They do not speak it plainly.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of them can not speak it at all?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I can not give you that percentage.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there some percentage of that kind there?

Mr. SINCLAIR. There are some of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any plan going on there, any schools, night schools, to teach these working men the English language?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How are they conducted?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, they have short sessions in the evening. I just don't know how they are conducted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that work carried on by the mills or by the Government?

Mr. SINCLAIR. By the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. By the mills?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long has that been going on?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That has been going on for three or four years that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the turnover of common labor frequent?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us any figures on that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, I can not give you accurate figures on that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is unskilled labor receiving in those mills?

Mr. SINCLAIR. You mean the laborers?

The CHAIRMAN. The unskilled labor.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think it is 42 or 43 cents an hour; that is, the general labor.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of it is that kind of labor?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I can not give you that figure.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the skilled laborer receiving?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They receive different prices. They are paid on the tonnage basis.

The CHAIRMAN. How are you paid?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am paid on the tonnage basis.

The CHAIRMAN. What do your wages amount to?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Per day?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. In the neighborhood of \$12 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there many who receive that much wage in this mill of 5,000 employees?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir; quite a few.

The CHAIRMAN. How many have you that receive \$12 a day?

Mr. LINDABURY. And upwards?

The CHAIRMAN. And upwards, yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And upwards—well, the heaters and rollers—I can not just give the percentage exactly, but the heaters and rollers are generally rated on about that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. You can not give us some idea of the percentage of heaters and rollers there are?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The percentage of heaters and rollers—you see, we have about eight or nine heaters in the one mill. I don't know just what they have at the lower mill, at the Merchants mill. I am not familiar with that end and don't know how many heaters they employ down there.

The CHAIRMAN. You can not give us much information on that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No; not the number of heaters they have there.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men in this mill have gone out on strike?

Mr. SINCLAIR. A very small percentage. I would say not over 5 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Not over 5 per cent? Are they what you term foreigners?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They are foreigners; nonnaturalized foreigners.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that mill running at full time now?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The mill is operating all right. We never had a bit of trouble.

Senator McKELLAR. Have any of the men who went out on strike come back?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the complaint of the men who went out on strike, if you know?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Do you mean the strikers?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I can not answer that. I don't think really that they know themselves. We ran along there for years and years, and there never was any intimation of trouble of any kind. The men were all satisfied. Then in this last couple of months, when this agitation was brought on, then that stirred up a little dissatisfaction among the men. The first day or two there were quite a few men that didn't come back; but the next day they were all back. They said they were afraid to come back. The only reason they had for not coming back was because they were afraid.

The CHAIRMAN. Afraid of what?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They were afraid of the strikers; afraid that they would be injured. But they are all working now, with a very few exceptions.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the hours of labor; the average hours of labor in that mill?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We have 12-hour labor, and the general labor is 10½ hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The general labor works 10½ hours?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The general labor works 10½ hours.

The CHAIRMAN. What class of labor works 12 hours?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The laborers that work inside, inside the mill, in the rolling mills, where the mills operate full time of 24 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. How long do you work?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Twelve hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that actual work, all of that time?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Actual work; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. At the end of the week, when the time comes to change shift, do you work through 24 hours?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any men that do that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. There is no man in the Duquesne mill that works 24 hours that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any riots there; any assemblages there that were riotous at all, in the town or on the streets?

Mr. SINCLAIR. About three or four weeks ago there was a crowd came in there and caused a little stirring, but there was no riot or no abuse of any kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any shooting?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No shooting.

The CHAIRMAN. Any clubbing?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No clubbing; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the State constabulary arrive there?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They have about two members of the State constabulary.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they do a good deal toward preserving order?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they terrify the people?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had charges here that they have terrified the people.

Mr. SINCLAIR. We haven't had any trouble up to the present time at all. I would say that there are not more than about 10 or 12 real strikers that are about that belong to the union. There may be more, but that is all I know of personally.

Senator WALSH. You haven't any real strike there at all if you have only 10 or 12 out of 5,000?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We do not consider it any trouble at all. The men have went along there; they are well satisfied. When this trouble came on they stood up almost as a unit and said that they were perfectly satisfied; that they were satisfied with conditions and their employers. We are as one family up there, the employers and employees work together. And they were perfectly satisfied. They did not want to be interfered with. All they wanted to do was to be left alone. They were satisfied.

Senator WALSH. Have you any extra police or deputies there?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, there are.

Senator WALSH. There are some?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. How many deputies and extra policemen are there now?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I can not answer that question.

Senator WALSH. Are you sure you are accurate in the figures you are giving us, that there is only about 5 per cent of 5,000 employees, namely, 250 employees, who went out on strike?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And you only know about 8 or 10 who are out on strike?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is all I know personally.

Senator WALSH. Why should there be need of extra deputies and policemen to maintain order with only 10 or 12 men out on strike?

Mr. SINCLAIR. When this trouble was stated to start on a certain day these men were given opportunity to be sworn in as deputies for their own protection.

Senator WALSH. Are there any guards up about the mills there at all now?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Any guards?

Senator WALSH. Yes; at the gates?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes; policemen.

Senator WALSH. I can not understand why, with so few men leaving a great plant of 5,000 employees, that they could cause any unrest or any disturbance, and that there were not enough police officers and constables in the community to control any outbreaks.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, looking at it in this way, as near as we could get the sentiment of the men, it was that they protested against any interference and they volunteered to go into this service so they



would be prepared in case of any infringement by anybody or anybody coming in and trying to run them out. That is the sum and substance of it.

Senator WALSH. The point I make is, how so few strikers can terrorize the whole community and the other employees.

Mr. REED. Senator Walsh, Duquesne is only a mile or two from some of the other large plants where there are a good many men out.

Senator WALSH. Then there are, in nearby towns, plants where there are many more men on strike than there are at this plant?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

Senator WALSH. The plant you are in has comparatively few strikers?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And, of course, it is necessary to have the guards and officers there, so as to prevent outbreaks caused by strikers from their plants?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a deputy yourself?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you got a sort of commission of some kind from the sheriff?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir. I got my oath through the sheriff's oath.

The CHAIRMAN. You signed an oath and sent it back? Are you furnished arms by anybody?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir. I go back and forth to my work without any arms at all.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no arms yourself?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir. They never furnished me any arms; any guns you mean?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. He asked if you had one.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have a gun in my home, yes. I do not carry it back and forth to the mill with me.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not on the pay roll of the State in any way?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir; voluntary.

The CHAIRMAN. A deputy sheriff paid by the Government?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Or paid by the steel company?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are drawing your wages just the same, aren't you?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am drawing my own wages that I work for.

The CHAIRMAN. You receive no extra pay for acting as a deputy?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there a good many guns around the mill?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. How many deputies are there in this particular mill?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I could not answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a good many, I suppose?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh, yes; I know of quite a number.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you any instructions from the sheriff in case of disorder?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What are your instructions?

Mr. SINCLAIR. To maintain the peace.

The CHAIRMAN. To maintain the peace?

Mr. SINCLAIR. To maintain the peace, to preserve order.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you a member of any labor union?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you at any time held membership in a labor union?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you refrained from joining a union because you feared that that would be displeasing to your employer?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir. I never had any desire, and I never was approached in my life.

Senator PHIPPS. You have never been solicited to join a union?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Never in my life.

Senator PHIPPS. Was there any vote taken at the Duquesne plant as to whether or not a strike should be called before this occurrence of the 22d of September, when the men were called out?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Not that I know of.

Senator PHIPPS. Who requested the men to go out on a strike?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Who requested them?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Where did the request come from?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The only trouble that they really had was a day there that Foster and some of his men came in there, on two occasions, and that was the only agitation they had there at any time.

Senator PHIPPS. And of the men who went on strike, remained away from work on the 22d of September, what number do you think belonged to a union?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I could not tell you.

Senator PHIPPS. Or were union men?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I could not tell you.

Senator PHIPPS. You have no information on it?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No; I could not answer that question.

Senator PHIPPS. It was not your belief that the employees of the Duquesne plant had joined the union, then?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Your understanding was the other way, that they had not become members and that they had not been solicited?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Yet the strike was ordered by some organization, surely?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know what organization communicated with the men?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not know what you might call it. There is an organization—all I know is that it is backed up by this man Foster and a fellow by the name of Fitzpatrick, but as far as any meetings are concerned I never knew of any being held in Duquesne. They made two trips there, but I do not know what effect it had.

Senator PHIPPS. They did hold meetings at Duquesne, did they not?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. On one of those two occasions?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They attempted to hold a meeting, but they did not hold that and went away.

Senator PHIPPS. Were they prevented by the authorities?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Why didn't they hold that meeting?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not know. I was not there at the time; I was not down in the town at the time.

Senator PHIPPS. In what form was the strike order issued which the men received? Was there a printed circular or a letter requesting the employees of the Duquesne plant to go on a strike?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, I do not know of any. There was some literature thrown around, but I do not know what it consisted of, but I do not know of any solicitation by letters.

Senator JONES. You said that the authorities prevented the holding of meetings for the purpose of organizing the union? What did the authorities do in order to prevent those meetings?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They congregated in the lower part of the town and they caused quite a stir there. They had the place blocked there from one end of the street to the other, and the officers just simply told them they would have to break up; that they were causing this crowd of people there and they were blockading the entire street, and that was all that was done at that meeting. And they came there on another Sunday, but they did not stop off. I do not know where they went to. They went on through somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the mayor issue any order about that meeting?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not know what his orders were.

Senator JONES. Have any of the mill officials or employes given any instructions in regard to the holding of meetings for the purpose of organizing the men?

Mr. SINCLAIR. None that I know of.

Senator JONES. Have any other attempts been made to organize the men than those you have just referred to?

Mr. SINCLAIR. None other that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard of anything the mayor has said to prevent meetings of that kind?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you this. You are a deputy without compensation. What is essential to be a deputy without compensation—a deputy sheriff? Can anybody up there be a deputy?

Mr. SINCLAIR. How is that?

The CHAIRMAN. Could any one go up there and be a deputy sheriff without compensation, or what is essential?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir. It was only for their own protection. Our understanding was that it was our own protection.

The CHAIRMAN. Have any of the strikers been made deputies, do you know?

Mr. SINCLAIR. None that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. But anybody can be sworn in as a deputy sheriff if he says it is for his own protection?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, sir. It was voluntary so far as I was concerned.

Senator WALSH. Not being a member of a labor organization, you do not know personally how many employes do belong to labor or-

ganizations, whether or not they have had any meetings, and what action if any they have taken, do you?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. All your information about that is hearsay, of course?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any more questions?

Senator PHIPPS. If there were meetings being held and organizations being made among the workmen in the mill, you would certainly have knowledge of it, would you not?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Why, I think I would. I never saw any disorder of any kind in the mills, and I have been there for the last 28 years.

Senator PHIPPS. No, I was not referring to disorder, but to this point.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I know.

Senator PHIPPS. If an attempt were being made to unionize the workmen in the plant, you certainly would have knowledge of it, would you not?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The sentiment I have got throughout the entire mills is that they were dissatisfied so far as this striking element was concerned, and they wanted to be left alone; they were satisfied with their working conditions and satisfied with their wages.

Senator JONES. Let me see if I got your point of view in regard to what I asked you a while ago. Do you mean for us to understand that during all the 28 years you have been there at Duquesne that no attempt was ever made to organize the men in the mills, other than the meetings to which you have referred?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh, no. I did not mean that. They tried to organize a strike some years ago. I do not remember much of it, though, but I know the mills never stopped operating at that time. I worked there.

Senator JONES. I did not have in mind the organization of the strike, but I had in mind the organization of the men into a labor union.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh.

Senator JONES. What efforts have been made from time to time, having that in mind?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have not heard of any.

Senator JONES. No attempts have been made to organize the men into unions, other than the meetings you have just referred to?

Mr. SINCLAIR. None that I know of.

Senator JONES. And what has been the sentiment there with regard to these labor organizations? Did the men feel free to join the labor organizations if they wished to?

Mr. SINCLAIR. There were no restrictions that I know of.

Senator JONES. And certainly no public meetings were held for the purpose of organizing the men other than the one meeting which you referred to, which took place when?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think it was three weeks ago Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN. That did not take place, did it?

Mr. SINCLAIR. How?

The CHAIRMAN. Did that meeting actually take place, as the Senator asked you, or was it stopped?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Did the meeting actually take place, you ask me?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. No.

Senator JONES. Then I will ask you when did these 5 per cent of the men organize into a union there; when did they join the labor organization?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not know that; I do not know whether they joined in Duquesne or not. Some of them went to Braddock.

Senator JONES. At this meeting were any of the organizers arrested?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all with this witness.

Mr. REID. The next witness is Mr. John P. Martin, of Youngstown, Ohio.

Senator WALSH. What is the purpose of this line of inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. I asked both sides of this controversy to produce men here showing the general conditions in the mill and the wages paid, and so forth. We will not follow it up any further than you desire.

Senator WALSH. No, I haven't any objection, except I do not see how we can make any report or our jurisdiction go beyond the question of just what acts on the part of employees or outside labor leaders and the officers of this company led to the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, general conditions are involved.

Senator PHIPPS. The conditions in all the mills, whether or not organization was prohibited by the employer, whether or not employees were discharged because they were joining the union.

The CHAIRMAN. There are only a few, I think, of these witnesses.

Mr. LINDABURY. As many as you desire, Senator Walsh. We produced these men in response to a letter from the chairman of the committee asking us to do so, for such inquiries as you might choose to make of them.

Senator WALSH. It is very helpful on the general situation.

Mr. LINDABURY. Now, you can carry it to any length you choose or stop when you are ready. I understand there are 20 of them here that have come down, and you may examine them all or not.

Senator WALSH. I do not know that I have any objections. It is very helpful on the treatment of the employees by the employers as to what the conditions are, how much wages they receive, but is that helpful to us here whether they are contented or not? It seems to me the question is here, What has caused this strike?

Mr. LINDABURY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Who is to blame, whether the labor agitators or the company's failure to deal through some representative of their employees?

Mr. REID. Perhaps these men can answer those questions for you, if you would ask them, sir.

Senator WALSH. I do not think that a workman in a remote factory, one odd workman's opinion, would be very valuable, if he did not read these communications, the letter from one side and the letter from the other.

Mr. LINDABURY. It is our information that of the men that have gone out, less than 1 per cent are Americans; that 99 per cent of the

Americans have remained in and have bitterly denounced the strike. Is it of account to know that in the investigation that you have before you, that these men have been able to come in and organize only the foreign element? Does that not bear on the general question?

Senator WALSH. It may, but to my mind—

Mr. LINDABURY (interposing). We thought it did.

Senator WALSH. To my mind the question of how these men have been treated and what their grievances are is a subsidiary question to what caused this strike.

Mr. LINDABURY. I suppose this committee is not going to spend days and weeks in determining the question as to whether Judge Gary ought or ought not to have met the committee. That certainly is a very small issue compared with the far greater one that I supposed you were looking into.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that this committee wants to go to the bottom of both sides of this controversy.

Mr. LINDABURY. I suppose so.

The CHAIRMAN. But of course we do not want to unduly prolong these hearings. With this sort of testimony I think we could limit it to perhaps five on each side that is, five representing the non-union men and five representing the union men. I do not think it is necessary to produce—

Mr. LINDABURY (interrupting). We are trying to meet the request of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Go on. You are taking up time now.

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN J. MARTIN, MACHINIST, OHIO MILL, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. MARTIN. John J. Martin.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live?

Mr. MARTIN. Youngstown, Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. What mill are you connected with?

Mr. MARTIN. The Ohio works.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that mill closed now?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed in that mill?

Mr. MARTIN. About 5,500 men.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many men are out on strike?

Mr. MARTIN. In that place, Mr. Senator, we might include the other two plants, known as the upper mill and the lower mill, and the whole three plants—and the McDonald—have in the neighborhood of 8,000 men.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many of those men are out on strike?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I think that that question ought to be qualified, Senator. That is a hard question to answer because we do not understand the foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not understand the foreigners?

Mr. MARTIN. We do not understand them.

The CHAIRMAN. And about how many of them are foreigners?

Mr. MARTIN. About 70 per cent, I should judge.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, when they are working in the mills don't you understand them, then?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you understand them, then, why is it you do not understand them when they are out?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it is so hard to get their sentiments and their intentions in regard to the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. What different nationalities are there represented in this 70 per cent?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, they are chiefly Slavs.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you say "foreigners" do you mean the unnaturalized or the naturalized American citizens?

Mr. MARTIN. I mean the unnaturalized and the naturalized; I mean the non-English-speaking people.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the non-English-speaking people?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are then employing about 70 per cent of non-English-speaking men in these mills, are you?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How did it happen that you have so many foreigners? How did it come about?

Mr. MARTIN. I could not answer that, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that go back very long?

Mr. MARTIN. No; it has not been recent. There have been foreigners in Youngstown for years.

The CHAIRMAN. And these mills are manned by foreigners to the extent of 70 per cent?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And were they brought in by the different companies from foreign lands?

Mr. MARTIN. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. How did they happen to get there, do you know?

Mr. MARTIN. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. How many different languages are spoken there in those mills?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I could not give the number, but there are Roumanian, Slav, Horwats—

The CHAIRMAN. What are they?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, they are from some part of Hungary, and Magyar and Horwats and Roumanians.

Senator McKELLAR. How many were at work there yesterday, of the 8,000 men in all the mills?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I could not tell you. I will make a statement, that the Americans, day before yesterday, since the strike commenced, we have been talking to the Americans, to the American element, to try to find out where they were at, and they held a meeting day before yesterday, which was the second meeting, and at that time they decided to go back to work. First a vote was taken as to whether or not they would affiliate with the organization, with this new organization, and they voted "no" unanimously. The vote was taken then as to whether or not they should go back to work, and it was carried unanimously with the exception of two votes.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many were there at the meeting?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, there was about two-thirds of them. I should say.

The CHAIRMAN. And were those all what you call Americans?

Mr. MARTIN. The American citizens, that is, English-speaking people, I mean.

The CHAIRMAN. And of these men that you speak of as foreigners, you differentiate between as non-English speaking and as English speaking?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are the same men that you designate as foreigners, as citizens?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your occupation?

Mr. MARTIN. Machinist.

Senator PHIPPS. And how long have you been employed there?

Mr. MARTIN. Seven years.

Senator PHIPPS. And have you ever belonged to a union yourself?

Mr. MARTIN. I have, but I do not now.

Senator PHIPPS. You formerly belonged to one?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And what was the reason that you left the union?

Mr. MARTIN. It was somewhat of a personal affair. I represented a labor organization in my time. I represented the machinists in that part of the country for a number of years.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you do?

Mr. MARTIN. I am a machinist.

Senator McKELLAR. And what is your pay?

Mr. MARTIN. I make about \$9 a day—\$8.96, to be exact.

Senator PHIPPS. For how many hours work?

Mr. MARTIN. Ten hours work; we work 10 and get 11; we work on an 8-hour basis.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many hours do the unskilled laborers work in that mill?

Mr. MARTIN. The unskilled laborers work 12 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. And what pay do they receive?

Mr. MARTIN. The lowest pay, I believe, at our plant is 42 cents an hour, and from that up. A very few, I understand—this is from hearsay—a very few receive 42 cents an hour; they most all receive more than 42 cents an hour and up as high as 50 cents an hour.

Senator WALSH. Have there been any disturbances at Youngstown?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir, not to mention, unless you would include great intimidation.

Senator WALSH. Upon the part of whom?

Mr. MARTIN. Sir?

Senator WALSH. Upon the part of whom?

Mr. MARTIN. On the part of the strikers.

Senator WALSH. Did you say how many men are on strike there?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, as I said to the Senator a while ago, that would depend upon what you mean by "on strike."

Senator WALSH. How many men left their employ voluntarily the first day?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, that does not help the matter.

Senator WALSH. What would you give as the number? Could you not give us the number?



Mr. MARTIN. I could not. I have no way of finding out whether they left voluntarily or through fear.

Senator WALSH. Well, how many left, either voluntarily or through fear?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I should judge about 50 per cent.

Senator WALSH. Fifty per cent?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. How many are out now at these various plants?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I should judge there is still 85 per cent of the men standing out.

Senator WALSH. You should judge there are 85 per cent of the men standing out?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; there is enough out to cripple us.

Senator WALSH. What do you mean by telling me that 50 per cent of the men went out on the first day and that 85 per cent of the men are standing out? Evidently we do not understand each other.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, we must define the question of going out and staying out afterwards owing to circumstances.

Senator WALSH. How many of the men went out?

Mr. MARTIN. About 50 per cent of the men went out directly through fear or allegiance to the organization, and 25 walked out owing to the condition.

Senator WALSH. So that there are now about 85 per cent of the men out—

Mr. MARTIN (interrupting). Yes, sir; I should judge.

Senator WALSH. For some reason or other?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And the first day only about 50 per cent of the employees went out?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And the other 35 per cent went out and have gone out voluntarily or through fear?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; or owing to other circumstances.

Senator WALSH. But there has been no disturbance?

Mr. MARTIN. Nothing outside of intimidation and maybe a couple of personal encounters.

Senator McKELLAR. And you think that only about 15 per cent of the original number of 8,000 men are at work now?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir. There is one point that I would like to emphasize in my testimony, and it is that question of intimidation, because it has to do with our Americanism. I believe that he ought to be entitled to all the lawful rights that are coming to us, and these men have carried on a system of intimidation that has been thoroughly un-American by the massing of thousands of men at the gate and by the threatening of the burning down of homes and the killing of families.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that they have threatened to do that?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; I have been threatened myself. On the first day of the strike the Americans who went to work, they included fully 90 per cent of the Americans or the English-speaking people in the heat plant, and they had nine heats, and the management had not figured that they would be tied up, and they were caught with nine heats in the open-hearth furnaces. The Americans realizing that condition, they were appealed to man the boilers and

take care of the power houses; they wanted to get them to keep them up, because to leave them to go down would mean a great expense in the furnaces in the rebuilding them and the loss to the men, etc. The Americans realized this and they stayed there. We fired the boilers—I was one of the men—we fired the boilers and kept the steam up, and in the evening we were threatened as we were going out of the gate—there were nearly a thousand people there, and one fellow hollered “We will get his home; we will burn his home.” I only heard one man say that, though.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you deputized?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What are you doing to instruct these men; what were you doing before the strike to instruct them in the English language?

Mr. MARTIN. We did everything. Do you mean just in reference to the strike?

The CHAIRMAN. No. You have 75 per cent of your men there who can not speak the English language, as I understand.

Mr. MARTIN. They are not conversant in the language, but we can talk to them; we can make ourselves understood.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you do anything to try to teach those people anything about this Government, its ideals and its institutions and what it stands for, or do you just get what labor you can out of them?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir. For the last couple of years, to my own personal knowledge, and maybe longer than that, but to my personal knowledge for the last couple of years, the Steel Corporation has established and conducted evening schools that these men may attend, where they are instructed in our language and in a knowledge of our institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they attend?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir. They have quite a class there at the Ohio works, where I work, and some of the officials of the plant sacrifice their evenings in order to teach them the language and teach them a knowledge of our institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. During the war did these men contribute to the Red Cross and buy Liberty bonds?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; they did, almost to a man.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of these same men who are striking?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any propaganda among those men you call foreigners along the line of Bolshevism and I. W. W.?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, judging from results, that must be all they got.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what results?

Mr. MARTIN. Why, it is the most un-American condition I ever saw; in my experience with the labor organizations we always appealed to the reason or the sense of justice of a man. In this fight the issue seems to be the saving of their homes, not the question of more money or shorter hours; because it is a known fact around the mills that the very people who are striking now for eight hours are the people who have stood in the way of the people securing eight hours in the past. That is a known fact. You never could talk eight hours to those people; they did not want that; all they could see was the money.

The CHAIRMAN. Do most of these people you speak of as foreigners own their own homes?

Mr. MARTIN. A great many of them, and right there, in our town, Youngstown, the Steel Corporation has built them homes, a cement house, that they are selling for \$5,000, to these foreigners, well worth the money, based on present values of real estate in Youngstown. They have instituted this home-building plan, and many Americans complain that they always give it to the foreigner first. Now, they started this home building with the foreigners first, but I will also state that we have word from the Steel Corporation, from their officials there, that they are now considering a plan to put this opportunity within the reach of all their employees; that if a man owns a lot anywhere in the city, he does not have to build his home on company ground or buy his ground from the company, if he owns a lot anywhere in the city the corporation will put him up a home and guarantee—I mean charge him 5 per cent interest, and guarantee him a saving of \$500 on the cost of the building; that is their guaranty. They have not got any further yet among us, more than to just feel the men out, how they stand toward the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. If conditions were so favorable there, how do you account for 85 per cent of the men going out?

Mr. MARTIN. I account for it by the un-American methods used by the organizers. I do not believe, from my personal knowledge of the American Federation of Labor, they represent the American Federation of Labor's principles. To cite one case, one phase of the matter, the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, a member of the parent body of the American Federation of Labor, were forced by this condition, which the American Federation of Labor approved of, to break their agreement with the employers there. In other words, the American Federation of Labor gave sanction to a condition that forces a member of the organization to break their contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have a strike there some years ago? When was the strike before this one?

Mr. MARTIN. It was before my time in that part of the country; I could not even tell you the year.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether English-speaking workers went out at that time?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, they did.

The CHAIRMAN. They went out?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir. I believe that they predominated at that time, the Americans did, in that part of the country.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been in Youngstown at this plant?

Mr. MARTIN. I have been at Youngstown 14 years.

Senator PHIPPS. And during that time have there been complaints which workmen, or committees of workmen, sought to have corrected by the foremen or superintendent of the plant?

Mr. MARTIN. We have standing instructions—not standing instructions, but we have a standing invitation at all times from Mr. Gross, our manager. The way we got that was in his address to the men during our Liberty bond campaigns, etc., where he had occasion to appear before the men; he said that at any time the men had anything

to say to him, be sure to come and tell him about it, any grievance. That has always been his attitude, so far as the Youngstown district is concerned.

Senator McKELLAR. You said you did not believe that this was the true doctrine of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Who have been proclaiming the doctrines that have been proclaimed at Youngstown; who has been agitating the matter?

Mr. MARTIN. I can only tell about those that are prominent now. A man named McCadden and a man named Hammersmark.

Senator McKELLAR. Has Mr. Foster been there at all?

Mr. MARTIN. I suppose he has been in and out.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know him?

Mr. MARTIN. No. I have not heard him speak.

Senator McKELLAR. You never heard him speak?

Mr. MARTIN. I know his book.

Senator McKELLAR. You read the book some years ago?

Mr. MARTIN. I read the book and that was enough.

Senator McKELLAR. What were the doctrines, as related in that book?

Mr. MARTIN. Anarchy.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know Mr. Fitzpatrick?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir; I do not. I have known him by reputation for a number of years.

Senator PHIPPS. Has he been in Youngstown recently?

Mr. MARTIN. Not to my knowledge.

Senator WALSH. I understood you to say, Mr. Martin, you thought these men seemed to be striking for their homes. Did you say that?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Just what did you mean by that?

Mr. MARTIN. That they were threatened with the burning down of their homes if they did not go out. Now, I have approached those men. I will tell you the attitude I took prior to the strike. The situation looked serious to me, and on my own volition I approached a number of these men, shopmates and millmates, and tried to find out what was in their minds that they were going on strike, what was the reason. I should know it because I was a fellow employee. I could not find out anything more than that. I asked the question, "Are you going to work next Monday?" The answer would be "I don't know. I like to work, but what am I going to do?" "What's the matter?" "Well, them fellows say they will burn my house down; I guess I had better stay home." Now, it was impossible to find out whether he belonged to the union and whether his heart is in the sentiments of the union or whether it is through fear.

Senator McKELLAR. Were these foreigners that talked to you that way—the men that talked as you described—were they foreigners?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; men that did not have very much command of our language.

Senator WALSH. Are there labor unions at Youngstown?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Among the employees there?

Mr. MARTIN. There is, yes.

Senator WALSH. Do you know whether they had a meeting and voted, as it is alleged here by some of the labor leaders? You know there has been evidence introduced that these members of the labor unions had meetings and cast votes in favor of a strike. Will you say that did not happen?

Mr. MARTIN. I would only have to give a kind of a guess, based on my knowledge of union affairs, and I would say I don't think there was a vote ever taken. I think the vote, Senator, just like the bill of grievances, was formed by the leaders. I am positive, from personal observation and talking with the foreigners, that these foreigners don't know what the 12 grievances are.

Senator JONES. How long have they been organizing the union at Youngstown?

Mr. MARTIN. For a year anyway. My knowledge is based upon newspaper accounts.

Senator JONES. And in what way has that work been carried on.

Mr. MARTIN. I could not tell you. I would not answer definitely on that. I would just pick up my evening paper in the evening, and see whether there was a meeting to be held for millmen in Ohio.

Senator JONES. Have those meetings been interfered with?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. The men have been free to meet and discuss conditions and join the union if they saw fit?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Has there been any attempt by officials of the mill to prevent their joining the union?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

Senator JONES of New Mexico. Have you any idea as to the number of men there at Youngstown who do belong to the union?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How are living conditions there? Are they good or bad?

Mr. MARTIN. The sentiment of the Americans—and I believe we are backed up by the foreign element there—is that we do not want more wages.

Senator McKELLAR. Your wages are fair?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do most of you own your homes?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, it is a good town for people owning their homes.

Senator McKELLAR. Are the houses pretty good, are they comfortable?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; you will find as fine homes in Youngstown as anywhere owned by workingmen. You would be surprised to see them.

Senator McKELLAR. The workingmen own good homes?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. They are comfortable and the men are apparently happy?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; in fact, a good many of them approach what you might designate as a mansion.

Senator McKELLAR. And some of these homes are owned by workingmen?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And there has been no complaint in regard to pay or in regard to working hours?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir; I never heard any—that is, just recent to this trouble.

Senator McKELLAR. What about recreations for the men? Does the company take any steps toward looking after the welfare and recreation of the men?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; they maintain a hospital at the plant.

Senator McKELLAR. They do maintain a hospital?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; not only for accidents, but a man is free to go there any time, if he has any physical complaint and have it attended to whether he receives an injury in the plant or out, they will attend to it.

Senator McKELLAR. If he works for the company?

Mr. MARTIN. If he works for the company; and the treatment is gratis.

Mr. LINDABURY. You were asked about recreation.

Mr. MARTIN. Oh. As to the recreation part of it, they have established a playground for the children and the young people of the neighborhood, chiefly for the foreign element.

Senator McKELLAR. What about the schools?

Mr. MARTIN. They have a mechanical school there; any young man working at the plant is eligible for the school; they receive all the benefits of it; they have men in the different departments to teach the school.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that school maintained by the employees or employers?

Mr. MARTIN. By the employers.

Senator McKELLAR. They have a qualified teacher or teachers to look after that school?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir. They teach a man right up from the very fundamentals; teach him his A B C's.

Senator McKELLAR. You say the hours of work are satisfactory; when you work more than an eight-hour day you allow time and a half for overtime?

Mr. MARTIN. Time and a half on an eight-hour basis, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. There was a statement made here the other day that made an impression on me, that every two weeks there were certain men, I believe rollers. I am not sure, I can not give the technical description, but that every two weeks they had to work one class of men 24 hours at a stretch.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, that is so at our place.

Senator McKELLAR. Will you describe how that is?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I shall have to qualify that word "work." Now you take a man who comes on just Sunday to Sunday. He may have a lot of operative work to do during the day time, but when that mill starts at half past 5 that man is at rest, if they do not have any breakdowns or any bad luck, that man is free to rest all night, so that you can not say he works 24 hours. He is on duty 24 hours.

Senator McKELLAR. I do not think I understood it fully from the other witness. What does that man do? What is his business? What is the character of his work?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, repairing the machinery, cleaning out the mill, and just to do whatever work is needed in an emergency.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of those men are there that work the 24 hours every two weeks of the 8,000?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not think there would be over 400 or 500.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there no way to avoid that very remarkable situation of a man working 24 hours?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, you could avoid it if you could get the consent of the men, but I do not think the men would consent to it.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they get time and a half for each hour overtime.

Mr. MARTIN. All over eight hours, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Then he is resting up all the next day, he can sleep.

Mr. MARTIN. He can sleep all the next day and come out that night; he changes shifts.

Mr. LINDABURY. They do not work any more hours in a week on account of it.

Senator McKELLAR. You mean the hours per week are the same as other work?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. But there are four or five hundred of these men every two weeks who have to work 24 hours a day under your rule?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that so in all of the plants?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Senator JONES. I was rather interested in the conditions such as were outlined in Youngstown, Ohio, with respect to the privilege the men have for meeting and discussing organization into labor unions. You have told us that they were perfectly free in Youngstown to have these meetings, discuss these affairs, and, if they chose, to join the labor union. The witness who just preceded you testified to quite a different state of affairs in the locality where he resided and where he worked; according to my recollection, he stated they were not permitted to hold any meetings at all. I believe that the witness lived in Pennsylvania. I am interested to know whether you can give us any light on that subject as to why one condition should exist in Ohio and another condition over in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I would base that upon the temperament or encouragement of the people, not encouragement, but reasonableness of the people.

Mr. LINDABURY. Will you pardon me saying I think you misunderstood the witness. He spoke only of one occasion when they had a block in the street and not any general conditions extending over any length of time, as I understood him.

Senator JONES. I may have rather overdrawn that.

Mr. LINDABURY. Blocking the streets, he said, you will remember, and he spoke of only the one occasion where they were interfered with.

Senator JONES. But I understood from him that they were not meeting over there; but at any rate in Youngstown, Ohio, there was no interference from the military authorities or the public authorities?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Senator JONES. Were they meeting for the purpose of organization?

Mr. MARTIN. The only interference I ever saw with a meeting in Youngstown, Ohio, was this: Last Friday night the American citizens of the Ohio works got together in a hall in a portion of the town known as Briar Hills, the purpose of the meeting being to find out whether American citizens were licked or whether they had still manhood enough left to go back to work. That hall was stoned by about 50 of the strikers during the meeting, stones thrown against the side of the building periodically while the meeting was going on. That is the first time I ever saw a meeting in Youngstown interfered with by anybody.

Senator WALSH. What is the population of Youngstown now?

Mr. MARTIN. About 125,000 people.

Senator WALSH. And it has, of course, all the police protection and methods of recreation and schools that any American city of that size has?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And of that 125,000 people only 8,000 are employed by the steel corporation?

Mr. MARTIN. We have in that town, if you want to extend that, a sheet and tubing concern employing 12,000 or 13,000; we have the Peoples Iron & Steel Co., with something like 60,000 or 70,000 men. idle—

Senator WALSH. Are these strikes?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. So there are three other industries that have strikes?

Mr. MARTIN. More than that, five or six steel industries, individual concerns.

Senator WALSH. They are independent strikes, independent of this one?

Mr. MARTIN. No; it is all one, the one strike. They are all in there.

Senator WALSH. Affiliated with this?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of those laborers are on strike, laborers for other concerns not connected with the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. MARTIN. I could not answer that.

Senator McKELLAR. I mean just approximately.

Mr. MARTIN. I will not even give a guess.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they run as to foreigners, what proportion of the employees of those mills?

Mr. MARTIN. About the same as the Ohio works or the Steel Corporation. I wish I had got that before I came away. The town runs between 50 and 60 per cent foreigners in population.

The CHAIRMAN. How does it happen that you have so many foreigners in your plant there? Is preference given to foreign labor rather than to American labor?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know. I think that would be a question for some of the steel officials to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are drawing a good salary there.



Mr. MARTIN. I know, but I do not know why they hire so many people.

The CHAIRMAN. So many foreigners?

Mr. MARTIN. Whether that is just because they are the kind of people who come along for the job or whether it is a defined plan, I do not know.

Mr. GARY. More Americans went to the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this condition similar to this before the war.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There were as many foreigners before the war in the mills as now?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that rather refutes your suggestion, Judge Gary?

Mr. GARY. Yes, it does.

Mr. MARTIN. Senator, I should like you to make note of this, that the steel corporation was the only concern in that part of the country that took back every exsoldier.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of these foreigners were soldiers, too, were they not?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. I can answer the question in regard to this. I do know of some industries that have done away with American citizen employees on the theory they were too intelligent and that they can get along better with foreigners, and now the foreigners have organized and are more belligerent than the Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. We hear a good deal about the strike being brought about by foreigners; that is one of the things we are looking into. Now, it seems a large proportion of the men employed, at least as far as the concern you are connected with is concerned, are foreigners, so we have the situation of the present steel company employing these foreigners in large numbers, more than Americans, then the foreigners bringing on the strike.

Mr. MARTIN. The reason the foreigners brought the strike on, Senator, was because they were the only people asked into the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Were not Americans asked to join the organization?

Mr. MARTIN. I have yet to meet the first American that has been approached by these organizers.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you really mean that the American Federation of Labor is not asking the Americans to join, and is asking the foreign workers to join?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a member of the Federation of Labor once, were you not?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that true at that time?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think then that the American Federation of Labor has changed and has become foreignized as to some of these industries?

Mr. MARTIN. My personal opinion is this: Somebody got in and scuttled the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have some trouble with the American Federation of Labor, some personal trouble?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say it was a personal question.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, that was local. I never had any controversy with the American Federation of Labor heads. That was only through politics. We had a little controversy, myself and Samuel Gompers, but that was political and not personal.

Senator McKELLAR. You say someone has gone ahead and scuttled the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Who was it that did it, in your judgment?

Mr. MARTIN. I think, if I were to pick out the king bee I would pick out Mr. Fitzpatrick. He is ably seconded by Mr. Foster. I think that those fellows are rearing a band of buccaneers in this country that are going to upset this Government if they are not stopped.

The CHAIRMAN. That is interesting. Just why do you say that about Mr. Fitzpatrick?

Mr. MARTIN. Because of his reputation in Chicago. He was always regarded as an autocrat and a radical.

Understand what I say about Mr. Fitzpatrick is based upon hearsay, and from my dealings with other men who have dealt with him in the past.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know him yourself?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I do not know him personally.

Senator McKELLAR. I believe you testified you did not know Mr. Foster, but you had read his books?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I do not know him. I have read his books; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. You make a charge here, which, of course, is a pretty serious one, that they are engaged in a campaign to practically overthrow the institutions of our country?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And we are interested in knowing your basis for arriving at that conclusion.

Senator McKELLAR. As I understand you, you went further than that, and said they were trying to overthrow the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Did I so understand you?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. LINDABURY. That isn't going further. That isn't going quite so far.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your basis for saying they have followed the writings of Mr. Foster—

Mr. MARTIN. That is based upon their methods.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you make that clear?

Mr. MARTIN. Their methods of organizing and their methods of conducting the strike is something unknown to the usages of American labor organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that this strike, in the method with which it is conducted, is different from the other strikes that have taken place in the past?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what respect?

Mr. MARTIN. In that instead of, as I said a while ago, appealing to a man's sense of justice and right, they seek to instill into his heart an awful fear of vengeance if he does not subscribe to their demands.

The CHAIRMAN. Have any of your men, who have been so threatened, gone to the authorities out there for protection?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a law-abiding community there and law enforcement, have you not?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you yourself suggested to the authorities that these matters ought to be looked into and that the men ought to be protected?

Mr. MARTIN. I have, to this extent. I went to the authorities the other day when I intended to hold a meeting of the Americans and asked for protection at the meeting—not protection, but that they prevent any disorder.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think 15 per cent of red-blooded Americans are able to take care of 85 per cent foreigners?

Mr. MARTIN. Senator, if you were to travel around amongst the men and see the awful condition you would think that there was time that something ought to be done for that condition.

The CHAIRMAN. For that condition? What condition?

Mr. MARTIN. Fearful condition.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't mean living condition?

Mr. MARTIN. Not living condition; I mean the condition of fear they are in.

The CHAIRMAN. They are terrorized, are they?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The 85 per cent or the 15 per cent?

Mr. MARTIN. The 15 per cent, the American element; the American element and the foreigners—you might make it 100 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all terrorized?

Mr. MARTIN. All terrorized. That is based upon my observation and my travel amongst them.

The CHAIRMAN. Not the 15 per cent are terrorized, but the 85 per cent?

Mr. MARTIN. No, they are terrorized by this doctrine that is being preached to them by these organizers.

The CHAIRMAN. The 85 per cent are not preaching that doctrine themselves, are they?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is being preached to them?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, it is being preached to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are meetings being held there at which that doctrine is being preached to them?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I could not go so far as to say that the doctrine is preached, but I can say the evidence is there.

The CHAIRMAN. Are addresses made to them in foreign tongues?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; they have foreign speakers there, and we can not tell what they say.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know what they say?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are foreign papers circulated among them?

Mr. MARTIN. Foreign papers—I can not read them, but they have a club there of foreign paper owners. They have formed what they call the Cosmopolitan Club for the purpose of making known the attitude of the better element of foreign people so far as this strike is concerned; that in a way they pity—in public statement published in a paper the other night they said they pitied the foreigner and asked the American to have patience with him in this strike; they pitied them on account of their ignorance; they said he was not altogether to blame for this strike, and they intimated in the article that there was somebody else responsible for the strike besides the foreigner.

Senator JONES. What is your position with the Steel Company?

Mr. MARTIN. Machinist.

Senator JONES. Is it part of your duty to mingle with the men and find out whether or not they have grievances?

Mr. MARTIN. No, not my duty; I am not paid for that. I do that from personal inclination.

Senator JONES. You spoke of this book by Mr. Foster. When did you get that book?

Mr. MARTIN. About six weeks ago.

Senator JONES. Where did you get it?

Mr. MARTIN. I got it from a fellow workman.

Senator JONES. Where?

Mr. MARTIN. From a fellow workman.

Senator JONES. Is that book generally circulated there?

Mr. MARTIN. No, not to my knowledge it is not. I see it has the sales price on it of 25 cents, but I do not know where it can be purchased.

Senator JONES. Is there any place where it can be obtained now?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know.

Senator JONES. What was your object in reading that book about three weeks ago?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I read the book to find out what position Mr. Foster took on this question, that is, this question of economics.

Senator JONES. Do you understand that that book is the basis of his present activity?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, if you take the method being employed and the way the strike is being conducted, after reading the book they look very similar. It looks like a movement toward that end that he preaches in the book. That is my judgment.

Senator JONES. Has Mr. Foster or any other representative of the American Federation of Labor been preaching the doctrine of that book in your community?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir. I have never heard any official of the American Federation of Labor or any organizer preach anything like what is in that book. They always preach conciliation and cooperation between employer and employees, and there has been no idea of conciliation shown in this strike whatever. It must be rule or ruin.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you a stockholder in the United States Steel Corporation? Do you own any of its stock?

Mr. MARTIN. I own two shares.

Senator PHIPPS. Are many of the employees in the Ohio plant stockholders in the company?

Mr. MARTIN. I am not in a position to state that.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not know?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there any special inducement made to the employee to purchase stock, other than the placing on it of a figure a little below the market price?

Mr. MARTIN. That is all. They never solicit you to subscribe to stock in our plant.

Senator PHIPPS. This was then a voluntary——

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, voluntary.

Senator PHIPPS. This was a voluntary purchase on the market and not through an offering of the company?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it common or preferred stock?

Mr. MARTIN. Common stock.

The CHAIRMAN. What dividends has it paid in the last two or three years?

Mr. MARTIN. Five per cent at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. And what last year?

Mr. GARY. It has been both, sometimes preferred and sometimes common; lately common stock.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. GARY. It has been sometimes preferred and other times common stock. Lately it has been common stock. It is very difficult to purchase any preferred stock.

Mr. LINDSBURY. I think the witness misunderstood the Senator, who had him say he got it on the market. I do not think he understood that.

Senator PHIPPS. Perhaps that is so. I was inquiring whether he had purchased it from the company.

Mr. MARTIN. From the company.

Senator PHIPPS. I want to know whether when you purchased it you were promised anything in addition to the regular dividend that might be declared on the stock?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; you got a special bonus from the company as an incentive to hold your stock. There is a special bonus paid by the company on the stock.

Mr. GARY. A rebate of \$5 a share for 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred dollar shares?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir; and they get a 25 per cent discount at the end of 5 years. If, in the meantime, an employee voluntarily leaves he can get his cash. He can give up his stock and get his cash.

Senator WALSH. The common stock has paid 16 per cent in dividends and earnings to the stockholders during the last few years, has it not?

Mr. MARTIN. There were times when it ran up in that neighborhood; yes.

Mr. GARY. It paid 17 per cent for a year?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; for one year.

Senator WALSH. For one year or two years?

Mr. GARY. About a year.

Mr. MARTIN. For about a year it ran to 17.

— Senator WALSH. Did I understand you to say that the English-speaking employees were in a state of fear lest violence be practiced against them on the part of the foreign employees of Youngstown?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Did I understand you to say that?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. That is, I suppose, because the foreign employees feel that the English-speaking employees do not sympathize with them in the strike?

Mr. MARTIN. No; it appears to me—

Senator WALSH. There isn't any racial feeling, is there?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, no.

Senator WALSH. It is because they feel they are out of sympathy, that they are not in unison with them, or what?

Mr. MARTIN. No; they feel, I think, that the threats that have been made against the Americans have been made because they feel that they needed the Americans to win and that they are spurred on by the fear that has been instilled in them.

Senator WALSH. It is coercion to force them into the union and to combine with them in the strike—

Mr. MARTIN. They haven't tried to force them into the unions; it isn't a question of forcing them into the organizations; it is a question of forcing them right out into the street, to get them out.

Mr. LINDABURY. Force them out of the mills?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And have them join the strike?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, that is the idea.

Senator McKELLAR. The great majority of those foreigners did not go into the war at all, did they?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, yes, they went.

Senator McKELLAR. What percentage of them went into the war?

Mr. MARTIN. I can not say what percentage, but every foreigner that was called on went, and many foreigners volunteered from my district. I might say this, and I believe it will cover the question, that they were all just as patriotic as anybody.

Senator McKELLAR. What proportion of them vote?

Mr. MARTIN. I am not in position to answer that question.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know what proportion are naturalized citizens of the United States?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think they ought to be naturalized citizens if they live over here?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir. I don't know whether it will do any good because we have lots of naturalized citizens now that ought to be deported.

Senator McKELLAR. I think that is true, too.

Mr. MARTIN. With some the papers do not do them any good. The papers just serve as a protection, that is all. If I had my way I would pick Mr. Foster and his like up, have them examined and if they were convicted of being monomaniacs and a menace to society, I would lock them up, because they are bringing suffering not only upon the Government, but they are bringing suffering upon a lot

of poor, innocent, ignorant people, which is unwarranted, and will lead nowhere.

The American Federation of Labor, so far as I have known them, have always worked along constructive lines, always with an aim of going forward. But this strike here seems to me to be just a move to bring things to a standstill and commence destruction. That is my best idea of the matter.

Senator PHIPPS. You have stated that no ballot was ever taken among the workmen to decide whether or not they would go on strike at this plant.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; we took a vote last Saturday and I will give the result—

Senator WALSH. That was the English speaking vote?

Senator PHIPPS. I have reference now to before September 22, when this strike was declared and the men called out. So far as your knowledge goes, and you are an employee, no ballot had been taken—

Mr. MARTIN. No; not to my knowledge.

Senator PHIPPS. As to whether they would strike or not?

Mr. MARTIN. No.

Senator PHIPPS. And so far as your information goes no attempt was made to organize the English speaking element of employees prior to the strike?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And organized efforts were made to have the foreign-speaking employees join the union?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all with this witness. Let me suggest that we had better go ahead with Judge Gary.

Mr. LINDABURY. What shall we do with the rest of these witnesses?

The CHAIRMAN. Can you keep them here until to-morrow?

Mr. LINDABURY. Yes, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you had better cull them out and leave us three or four witnesses from the different parts or points. We do not want cumulative testimony.

Mr. LINDABURY. I think none of them are cumulative. We sent to the various localities and no two of them are from the same locality, as I understand it. Of course, we will reduce the number, just as the committee desires. Shall we reduce the number to, say, five men?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; five more will be sufficient.

Mr. LINDABURY. Five more to keep for to-morrow and no two from the same plant or the same locality.

Senator MCKELLAR. Will there be one man from each locality?

Mr. LINDABURY. I can not answer that now. We will try to make it so. We will try to have them from different parts of the country.

Senator MCKELLAR. I think that that would be better.

Mr. LINDABURY. We will try to retain one from each plant or locality, whether we use them or not.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be all right. Perhaps we can finish this witness before we go on with Judge Gary.

Mr. LINDABURY. I do not think it will take very long.

**STATEMENT OF T. P. O'CONNELL, ROLLER, NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO.**

The CHAIRMAN. Please state your name.

Mr. O'CONNELL. T. P. O'Connell.

The CHAIRMAN. State where you are from.

Mr. O'CONNELL. New Philadelphia, Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a steel mill there?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And are you connected with that mill?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what capacity?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Roller.

Mr. LINDABURY. Will you locate that with reference to some other place in Ohio—Youngstown or some other place; I do not know where it is.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The American Sheet Steel; there are two plants operated under the same management, and they employ about 1,500 men.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you worked there?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I have worked there about 32 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-two years. Have you had any strike there before?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When?

Mr. O'CONNELL. 1901.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you a union man?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you now a member of the union?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Not as you could notice.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you leave the union?

Mr. O'CONNELL. In 1901.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the strike?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of the men in this mill would you say were foreigners?

Mr. O'CONNELL. We have not got a great many foreigners in our plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what per cent?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, probably 10 per cent or less.

The CHAIRMAN. And what percentage are now on strike?

Mr. O'CONNELL. There are not any.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. O'CONNELL. There ain't any out.

The CHAIRMAN. Your plant is running?

Mr. O'CONNELL. One hundred per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. And there are none out?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you have not come into intimate relationship with this strike?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No; not so far as the strike is concerned:

Senator McKELLAR. Is there any danger of these men going out?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I do not think so.

Senator McKELLAR. You think they are all going to stay in?



Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you think it is because of the lack of foreign element—

Mr. O'CONNELL. We have lots of that element there in that community, of the alien element.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you think it is because of the foreign element that the strike has taken place?

Mr. O'CONNELL. That and the agitators, this man Foster, and a few more of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any attempt made to have the men go out there?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made the attempt?

Mr. O'CONNELL. These organizers.

The CHAIRMAN. Who do you mean by "these organizers"?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, the men that the Federation of Labor sent around.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they been out there in the plant?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir; they have been out there in the town.

The CHAIRMAN. Have there been any complaints about conditions in the plants?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there ever been an attempt made to unionize the plant? Has the plant ever been unionized?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No, sir; it has not been unionized.

Senator PHIPPS. You mean since 1901?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I mean since 1901, since the corporation took hold.

Senator PHIPPS. Why did you leave the union? You were formerly a member of some union?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir; I belonged to the amalgamated association.

Senator PHIPPS. Why did you give up your card in the amalgamated association?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, I gave up my card in the amalgamated associations because I saw that the conditions were bad at the time. I was a little apprehensive when the corporation took the mills over, but the conditions bettered every year from 1901 up to the present time in our business, in our line, and I could not see any benefit in belonging to the union.

Senator STERLING. But you say there was an attempt made to organize the men for the purpose of the present strike?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Sir?

Senator STERLING. An attempt has been made to organize the men for the purpose of the present strike?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What were their methods in trying to organize the men?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, they would approach the men individually and would go to their homes, and would have their meetings in a hall—the Federation of Labor would have their meetings there.

Senator STERLING. They did not come into the shop and try to talk to the men?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No; they did not go into the shops and try to talk to the men.

Senator STERLING. But they would have meetings?

Mr. O'CONNELL. They did have meetings, and they are having them yet; some of them.

Senator WALSH. Is it your experience, Mr. O'Connell, as a laboring man, that the conservative forces in America among the laboring classes are the English-speaking workmen?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir; without a doubt of it.

Senator STERLING. Were these meetings of which you speak addressed by any of the men employed in your own plant?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Pardon me. I did not understand you.

Senator STERLING. Were these meetings addressed by men who were employed in your own plant—these meetings for the purpose of organizing the men—addressed by any of the men from your own plant?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No; it was all outside.

Mr. STERLING. They were all outside?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; people affiliated with other unions in the community of the Federation of Labor.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your pay? How much do you receive?

Mr. O'CONNELL. My pay?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, I get pretty good wages.

Senator McKELLAR. I would like to hear it.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Twenty dollars.

Senator McKELLAR. How much?

Mr. O'CONNELL. About \$20.

Senator McKELLAR. Twenty dollars a day?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You are a roller, are you?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you also a stockholder in the company?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. To what extent are you a stockholder?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Sir?

Senator McKELLAR. To what extent are you a stockholder?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Oh, well, more or less; some years more and some years less.

Senator McKELLAR. I hope it is more. You have no objections to stating, have you?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Sir?

Senator McKELLAR. The interest a man has in a company is always a matter of legitimate inquiry, and I would like to know to what extent you are interested in the company, and I think the committee would like to know that.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, I have not got a great deal. I have got probably 25 share of stock, common.

Senator McKELLAR. You bought it at various times?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, some of it I got did not cost me a cent.

Senator McKELLAR. You got it by way of bonuses or something like that?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. For good work done by you for the company?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir; and bonuses and under the employees' stock subscription. The employees get bonuses every year, and at the end of five years' service they get an extraordinary bonus. We have got men in our plant that have got an income which would keep them from the stock they had.

Senator McKELLAR. And are a great many of the men working in the shops stockholders also?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Oh, a big per cent of them.

Senator McKELLAR. What percentage would you say?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Now, of the skilled workers—

Senator McKELLAR. I can not expect you to be exactly accurate.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Of the skilled workers 80 per cent have stock.

Senator McKELLAR. Eighty per cent of the skilled workers have stock?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; about 85 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. About 85 per cent?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What percentage of your plant is composed of skilled workers?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Well, 80 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. Eighty per cent of the plant. So that quite a large majority of the workers in your plant are stockholders?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you have been with the company since its organization?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And I suppose, by saying you have been 32 years in the business, that you were with the company before it was organized?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. I think it ought to appear in the record, Mr. Chairman, that if Mr. O'Connell works every day in the year his wage income will be as much as a United States Senator, within \$200.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. O'Connell, how many hours a day do you work?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Eight hours.

Senator PHIPPS. Eight-hour turns at your mill?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And only six days a week?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Five and six.

Senator PHIPPS. Five and six days?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Every third week six days.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you work seven days a week during the war period?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No.

Senator PHIPPS. That was not necessary in your line?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No. During the war period we did not make much war stuff. The result was that we did not do so much work. What little we did work was war work, of course. Of course, all the mills and all the steel line did not work. There was not the demand for our products for war purposes.

Senator PHIPPS. Still, by reason of the war, your compensation was somewhat higher than it had been?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Sir?

Senator PHIPPS. You received some increase in your pay on account of war conditions, did you not?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No.

Senator PHIPPS. It did not affect you?

Mr. O'CONNELL. No.

Senator PHIPPS. You are paid by the ton?

Mr. O'CONNELL. We are getting probably 6 per cent more a year now. We are paid by the ton. We are paid tonnage, on a tonnage basis.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Witness, I guess.

Mr. LINDABURY. Do you want Judge Gary now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LINDABURY. The judge has stepped out for the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Possibly, if you have a short witness, we could put him on until the judge returns.

Senator McKELLAR. Let us take another one and go on while we are waiting.

Mr. REID. Mr. Jacobs.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM H. JACOBS, CLAIRTON, PA.

Mr. LINDABURY. This is Mr. William H. Jacobs, of Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is your home?

Mr. JACOBS. Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you connected with any of these steel mills?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what capacity?

Mr. JACOBS. Heater in the 14-inch mills.

Senator McKELLAR. Talk a little louder, please.

Mr. JACOBS. I am a heater in the 14-inch mill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a stockholder in the Steel Corporation?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much stock do you hold?

Mr. JACOBS. Twenty-five shares.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed in the mill where you are working?

Mr. JACOBS. About 40.

The CHAIRMAN. Only 40 men employed?

Mr. REID. When he says "mill" he means rollers.

Senator PHIPPS. In the whole plant?

Mr. JACOBS. Between four and five thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are out on a strike?

Mr. JACOBS. I would say about 10 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men employed there are what are termed foreigners, non-English speaking?

Mr. JACOBS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any idea?

Mr. JACOBS. It runs pretty high; I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of the men who have gone out are foreigners?

Mr. JACOBS. Practically all.

The CHAIRMAN. Have none of the Americans gone out?

Mr. JACOBS. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. And what has been the complaint of the men that have gone out?

Mr. JACOBS. That we do not seem to be able to find out.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you tried?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did they say?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, the Americans—one thing is their fear.

The CHAIRMAN. Fear of what?

Mr. JACOBS. Fear of the strikers molesting them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you followed that out to see whether there has been anything of the kind?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What have you found out?

Mr. JACOBS. I found out in going to work last Monday morning a week ago they shot at some men going down the walk.

The CHAIRMAN. Who shot at them?

Mr. JACOBS. I do not know.

Senator McKELLAR. Did they hit them?

Mr. JACOBS. It was supposed to be strikers.

Senator McKELLAR. I say, was anybody hurt when they shot at them?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have this State constabulary there?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they done any shooting?

Mr. JACOBS. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they been intimidating people?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the mayor of your town?

Mr. JACOBS. We have a burgess—Mr. Farmsworth.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he connected with the Steel Corporation in any way?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his connection?

Mr. JACOBS. Chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Chief clerk of what?

Mr. JACOBS. Of the steel plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Has he given any orders about meetings?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What have the orders been?

Mr. JACOBS. That there would be no gatherings on the streets. So far as I know, that is about all.

The CHAIRMAN. Have there been any gatherings in buildings to talk over the situation?

Mr. JACOBS. Not in Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. There have not been?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the population of Clairton?

Mr. JACOBS. About 8,000, I think.

Senator PHIPPS. Was this burgess elected by a vote of the people?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. In the borough?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. He was not appointed, by the Steel Corporation to the position of Burgess?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. We hope not.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you been a member of any union labor organization at any time?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been employed in the steel works?

Mr. JACOBS. Seventeen years.

Senator PHIPPS. Where were you employed before you came to the Clairton plant?

Mr. JACOBS. Jones & Laughlin.

Senator PHIPPS. That is generally understood to be a union shop, is it not, Jones & Laughlin?

Mr. JACOBS. That I do not know.

Senator PHIPPS. But it was not necessary for you to belong to a union in order to work in the Jones & Laughlin plant?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Was any attempt made to organize the employees of the Clairton plant into these labor unions before the calling of this strike?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Was any ballot taken among the workmen to know whether or not they should obey the strike order?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not believe that any such ballot could have been taken without your knowledge, do you?

Mr. JACOBS. I am positive there was none taken.

Senator PHIPPS. How were the men ordered out? What was the method followed under which some of the employees left their work on September 22?

Mr. JACOBS. That is what the Americans can not find out.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you come into possession of any notices, requests or printed circulars concerning the strike?

Mr. JACOBS. I saw on my front porch one morning something with four different languages on it, which I could not read, with the exception of "\$3" marked on it, which I suppose was a call to join the union.

Senator PHIPPS. You did not have that interpreted then?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You did not go to the trouble of finding out what it was?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir; I do not know what it was.

Senator STERLING. Have any of the workers who left returned to work?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What proportion, would you say?

Mr. JACOBS. I could not say positively, but perhaps one-half.

Senator STERLING. Perhaps one-half?

Mr. JACOBS. Perhaps one-half.

Senator PHIPPS. About what are your average earnings?

Mr. JACOBS. About \$175 to \$180 a month.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you paid by the ton, or how?

Mr. JACOBS. By the ton.

Senator PHIPPS. By ton.

Mr. JACOBS. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. And you average about \$175 a month?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. And how many hours per day?

Mr. JACOBS. Twelve.

Senator PHIPPS. You are on a 12-hour turn up there?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, during that 12 hours are you constantly employed?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What are the intervals of time, and how are they caused?

Mr. JACOBS. It varies sometimes from one to five and six hours that I do not do anything.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the occasion for that? What are you waiting for?

Mr. JACOBS. That is, that the mill is not in operation. We still have our work to look after, but it is not strenuous.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your duty? What employment have you?

Mr. JACOBS. It is my duty to see that the steel is in fit and proper condition to roll.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you classed as an inspector?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir; classed as a heater.

Senator PHIPPS. Classed as a heater?

Mr. JACOBS. And it is my business to keep it that way.

Senator STERLING. That requires an expert knowledge, does it?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What would be the average length of time, over a period of twelve hours, in ordinary times, that you would be actively engaged? Would you be engaged six hours out of the twelve, or more than that?

Mr. JACOBS. That would be pretty hard to decide. In normal times, and good running orders, we will work probably ten hours out of the twelve.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. JACOBS. And we have worked for twelve hours with but very little stoppage in the mill, but usually we get from one to four hours.

Mr. LINDABURY. Would you mind asking how much physical labor is involved?

Senator PHIPPS. That is the very question I had on the end of my tongue. I want to know whether your duties include any manual labor; that is, the physical labor of actually handling the steel or the scrap or the pig iron from which the steel is made.

Mr. JACOBS. Why, that is all done by machinery.

Senator PHIPPS. And your duty is that of conducting a superintending operation of melting the steel in the furnace, or are you on a heating furnace? I want to know whether you are working on an open-hearth furnace or the small heating furnace?

Mr. JACOBS. I have charge of it going in the furnace and coming out of the furnace.

Senator PHIPPS. It goes in in the form of a slab or a billet?

Mr. JACOBS. A billet.

Senator PHIPPS. And that is all a mechanical operation?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. After the heating furnace has been charged with the steel billets, which are cold at the time, there is quite an interval of time when you are simply noticing how the temperature is rising, or how the steel is being heated, and up to the point that you draw it from the furnace there is not much involved in the way of work, is there?

Mr. JACOBS. No, sir; not until that time.

Senator STERLING. Do you have the basic eight-hour day in your mill?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. With pay for overtime?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That pay is pay and a half, is it, for overtime?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Witness.

Senator McKELLAR. Congressman Steele of Pennsylvania has a matter that he wishes to bring briefly to the attention of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Steele.

**STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY J. STEELE, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS  
FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.**

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I represent the twenty-sixth congressional district of Pennsylvania, in which is located the plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co. I am this morning in receipt of a long telegram from the Central Trades and Labor Council of Bethlehem, representing the striking employees of that company, in which they request me to ask this committee to visit Bethlehem and investigate the plant and the labor conditions at that plant. This is quite a long telegram, setting forth a number of grievances and misrepresentations, as they state, and I will be glad to submit this telegram to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We have that telegram. We have not been placing these telegrams in the record, because there are a great many of them, on both sides, and it would encumber the record too much to put them all in.

Mr. STEELE. Very well. I will leave the telegram with the committee. In that connection I would like to call the attention of the committee to a clipping from the Philadelphia Record, a dispatch from Bethlehem dated October 1, saying that the officials of the company would welcome a visit of Senator Kenyon and his investigating committee, whom they propose to show through the plant, "to demonstrate the truth of the claims" the company makes.

So this request to visit the Bethlehem plant, it seems, comes from both the men and the company.

Senator WALSH. As I understand it, you simply transmit to the committee these requests from your constituents?



Mr. STEELE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We have telegrams from chambers of commerce and commercial clubs of different towns asking the committee to come, and these requests have come from both sides. As to the committee visiting that region, I think no one ever imagined that there was anything harmful to anybody in having the committee try to get any information it can.

Mr. STEELE. I think that is the attitude of the company and the men.

**STATEMENT OF MR. MICHAEL F. TIGHE, PRESIDENT OF THE AMALGAMATED ASSOCIATION OF IRON, STEEL, AND TIN WORKERS OF NORTH AMERICA.**

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business, Mr. Tighe?

Mr. TIGHE. I am president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is your home?

Mr. TIGHE. Pittsburgh, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the 24 associations?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please tell us now what your association did toward calling this strike, and what were the reasons for the strike, and all about it?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir; I will try to. I will preface my remarks, Senators, with the statement that I am only an ordinary workingman. I may not be able to be as fluent as the honorable judge in his statements, but I wish to state that I will present to you the exact facts, and not the theories, which I am led to believe the honorable judge was led into in a great many of his statements here. I listened very attentively to his statements, and, from the knowledge that I possess of the actual conditions that exist I wish to state that I think he has been very badly informed on many questions relative to the working of the institutions of which he is the head of the corporation. To do so, it will be necessary for me to go back, in as brief a manner as possible, antedating the institution of the United States Steel Corporation, because it is one of the pertinent and very important features of this investigation, as I understand it, to get the cause of this industrial unrest and strike, as well as its effects at the present time.

The foreigner, as he has been so called, and as it has been very elaborately expounded here, is one of the features of this investigation, and I take it that you, Senators, in your desire to get a little light upon this subject by the questions that have been asked, would like to find out just exactly the reasons why the foreign element is so prominent in the steel industry of this country, and why the American workman has been considerably eliminated from those industries.

It is a historical fact that in 1892, on July 6, there was a severe strike in the Homestead Works, Homestead, Pa. At that time fully 90, yes, more than, I presume—I do not know whether there were any foreign elements engaged in the making of steel in that vicinity—they were largely American workingmen—

Senator WOLCOTT. You mean that 90 per cent were American?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. What was your occupation at that time?

Mr. TIGHE. I was a puddler by trade at the time.

Senator PHIPPS. Where?

Mr. TIGHE. I was not living in Pittsburgh at that time, but was closely connected with the organization work. Mahlon Garland, the Congressman at large from Pennsylvania, was the president of our organization at the time. I had been a representative to the national conventions, representing my lodge. I have been a member of the organization for over 40 years, taking an active interest in its work.

I was thoroughly conversant with the workings of those plants at that time. The strike was against a reduction in wages of the men in the Carnegie plants at that time. The result of that strike was that the organization lost out, and after it had lost out a system of espionage was adopted in those plants, which made it so obnoxious to the men employed there that one could not trust the other. The result was that many of them left the employment, hunted other employment, and that was the beginning of the influx of foreign labor into the steel mills. I state this so that you will thoroughly understand it.

In 1899 the American Sheet and Tin Plate Co. was formed. It was composed of all the union plants, and a large number of nonunion plants, who were in somewhat isolated positions throughout the manufacturing districts. When trade conditions became a little slack, owing to the fact that nonunion men were working at a lower rate of wages than the union plants, the union men, those mills were naturally closed down and the union men were deprived of their means of employment.

This of course brought about considerable dissatisfaction, and it was increasing among the ranks of our membership by reason of the fact that this organization, known as the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co., was operating a nonunion plant and allowing the union men to walk the streets. We had several conferences among ourselves trying to see if there was not a solution to the proposition. Some suggested that it might be a good idea for the union men to come down to the same rates as the non-union men, but immediately the question came before them, was there any assurance that the non-union men would not come down to the same degree that it was before.

This condition existed until 1901, the time of the formation of the United States Steel Corporation, when a demand was made in our Milwaukee Convention by the men who were interested and who claimed that they had been discriminated against in the distribution of their work, in the scale of wages which governed the trade, that scale of wages should be equalized, or in other words, that the United States Steel Corporation, owning and controlling all of those plants, should pay the wages that the union mills were paying.

Senator PHIPPS. At that point, I think that the committee would like to know what your connection with the amalgamated association was at the time you are speaking of, 1899 and 1901.

Mr. TIGHE. In 1899 I was elected as national assistant secretary of the association, in the convention of 1899, and I was a member of the national executive board and national assistant secretary in the 1901 strike, taking a very active part in it, Senator.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; and did you still continue your occupation in the plant where you were employed?

Mr. TIGHE. No, no. When I was elected national assistant secretary I had to give up my position.

Senator PHIPPS. You did not answer my question of a few moments ago of which plant you were employed in.

Mr. TIGHE. I was employed in the Wheeling Iron & Steel Co., for 30 years' continuous employment. I started to work at the age of 10 years and was in continuous employment for 30 years, until I was elected national assistant secretary.

Senator WOLCOTT. You spoke of foreigners coming in 1892, and I do not know whether you said they came in after 1901 or not. Did the steel industry have anything to do with getting these men in, as a corporation or as a body?

Mr. TIGHE. Now, I would not be positive of that position, Senator. I do not wish to state anything that I have not personal absolute knowledge of.

Senator WOLCOTT. No; surely not. I only want to stick to facts.

Mr. TIGHE. Of course we hear from the men, you know, but to say to a certainty that they had done that, I was not in a position to state.

Senator PHIPPS. Let me ask you if it is not a fact that prior to 1892 a large percentage of the workmen, particularly the unskilled workmen in the plants in Wheeling and Pittsburgh, were foreigners?

Mr. TIGHE. No, sir; they were not.

Senator PHIPPS. They were not?

Mr. TIGHE. No; they were not. They were not. The reason I know it is because during both periods I went to work in the blast furnaces as well as in the mills, and consequently I understood the men working at laboring work at that time; they were largely English-speaking people.

Senator WOLCOTT. And you say that prior to 1892 that 90 per cent of them were English-speaking people?

Mr. TIGHE. That was in the skilled work. The Senator is asking about the labor.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course the conditions might have been somewhat different in the Pittsburgh district, in the Homestead and Pittsburgh mills.

Mr. TIGHE. I do not think there was, because during our convention period, we held our national conventions in the Forbes Street hall, and we generally had an invitation to go up around Homestead from the superintendent's office, and I know that at that time—

Senator PHIPPS. Well, I know that I was serving my apprenticeship when I was 13 years old and at least 90 per cent of the common labor in the mills in Pittsburgh were Germans.

Mr. TIGHE. But they were English speaking people. The Germans were English speaking people. They were mostly Welsh, German, English, and other English speaking people. I meant that they were not the Slavish; I meant those Slavish as foreigners and the southern Europeans.

Senator PHIPPS. But that is in the Pittsburgh Union Mill. They were Slavs and Germans.

Mr. TIGHE. I desire to say now that that is where you and I differ.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes, but you are speaking of Wheeling and I am speaking of Pittsburgh. I do not question your statement at all.

Mr. TIGHE. I am speaking from the association standpoint and the knowledge I had through our association work. At the Milwaukee convention they passed a resolution ordering the conference committee or organization to demand the scale defined for all the mills of the corporation. That was refused by the corporation and a strike was called; some called it a sympathetic strike in some departments. Our organization was composed largely of four divisions at that time. From the 1892 strike, owing to the severe conditions that existed in these plants, the absolute impossibility of men belonging to a labor organization without being discharged, there was no organization and but very few organizations in the steel mills. We undertook to organize a lodge in Homestead in 1899. They held one meeting, and the next day 144 of them, so it was reported to us in our convention, were called in—that was the number of men who attended that meeting—and given their discharge for attending that meeting. That had a natural tendency to make the men fearful to even attempt to organize the steel mills. The fact that the Homestead or the Carnegie Steel Co. had adopted such measures naturally prevented the organization in their steel plants, because they looked at it as one of the means of which they would follow suit. In the 1901 strike they refused to negotiate for all their mills.

(Thereupon, at 12.45 o'clock p. m., the hearing was adjourned until the following day, October 3, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

# INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 235, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Borah, Sterling, Phipps, McKellar, Wolcott, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

Also present: William Z. Foster, organizer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen; Michael F. Tighe, president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of North America; Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor; W. B. Rubin, counsel for the steel committee of the American Federation of Labor.

## STATEMENT OF MR. M. F. TIGHE—Resumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Tighe, we realize that we interrupted you rather abruptly yesterday, but the committee was compelled to go to the Senate. You may now proceed.

Mr. TIGHE. There is no apology necessary, Senator. I understood the situation thoroughly and was very thankful that you was trying to perform the onerous duties you have to perform. It certainly affords me much pleasure to see that you are interested in this matter to the extent that you are giving your time and attention to it. At the close of the session yesterday, I had led up to the formation of the United States Steel Corporation. I had tried to show to the Senators that a large portion of the influx of the foreign element, as it called—I do not like to use that word very prominently, but the non-English speaking proportion of the community—the influx was due to a reduction in wages, and the strike against a very large reduction in wages, and if the Senators, at some time or other, would go into that phase of the situation I am certain that they would find it to be a most interesting one. I am referring to the Homestead strike, because, from my point of view, it was largely instrumental in keeping the panic in existence, which at that time was just about coming into existence. That reduction in wages reduced the price of steel, which was an active competitor of iron, to such an extent that none of the iron mills could operate, and the closing down of those iron mills added to the conditions, which were the beginning of those conditions in the country.

I mention that so you will understand that, from my point of view, the reduction in wages at the Homestead strike at that time had

a bearing on the industrial condition of the country and in the following years we had a very severe panic.

The panic, of course, had a bearing in eliminating some of the men from the mills, bringing into existence low-priced men in each of those plants. The espionage, as I stated yesterday, was something terrific; no man could trust the other.

This, of course, had nothing to do with the formation of the United States Steel Corporation. The formation of the United States Steel Corporation brought about a complex condition in the steel industry, and at this time perhaps it might be well for me to say, so that you may know, that there is a differential between the different processes in the mill, so that you will understand as you go along. There are the blast furnaces, which convert the ore into the metal. There is then the open hearth furnace, which converts the metal into what we call the crude product. The same applies to what is called the puddling department, so that there is that differential between the two. We had nothing to do with the blast furnace element, as our organization at that time was composed of skilled men largely. We had a constitutional clause which provided that all men working in and around rolling mills, factories and so on, and that controls the skilled men in their entirety and the blast furnace element did not come under the category of skilled men at that time.

As I stated yesterday, the institution of the steel corporation brought about a complex condition, nonunion mills which were brought into it, as the honorable judge stated yesterday. Those mills were a menace to our people from the fact that they were operated at from 10 to 20 per cent below our scale of wages, and our scale of wages was the basic wage paid in those industries at that time.

I have, and will submit after a while, the Western scale of wages governing roller mills, which will demonstrate, beyond all question of doubt, that in place of the United States Steel Corporation being the advance agent in the fixing of wages and working conditions, that the Amalgamated Association, the parent body of organized labor in the steel mills, is the advance agent from which wages and working conditions are taken, and that the corporation, in place of being the advance agent, was certainly the rear guard.

Senator STERLING. Pardon me, Mr. Tighe, for interrupting, but when you speak of "our" scale of wages, what do you mean? Do you mean that scale of wages fixed by the Amalgamated Association?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes. I will explain that in detail, Senator, as I go along, for your information.

It was at the convention in Milwaukee that our membership decided to have an equalization of the rate, which brought about the strike of 1901. The Carnegie Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, had the Carnegie interest, and many of the union mills which made finished bar iron in their division. The sheet division at that time had the Vandergraft interest, which was non-union, located in what we generally termed the Black Valley. The tin was in another division. When I say "division" I mean the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation in their formation.

The tin division was completely organized, so far as contracts were concerned, with the exception of one mill at Monessen, Pa., which

had a special mill and did not come under our scale of wages. The sheet was divided. The bar iron was divided.

At the conference the bar iron representatives of the Carnegie interests withdrew from the conference by reason of the action of the convention in demanding the equalization of wages in all the mills. The sheet also withdrew. The tin scale was signed tentatively, a contract was entered into with the tin division or subsidiary company tentatively, with the understanding that—we had a law that was passed that same year at our annual convention recognizing the power and influence of the corporation in its formation, a law was passed where any one mill in our organization would have a grievance with the corporation, all other mills under our jurisdiction should cease work. Some have termed it a sympathetic strike, by reason of others going out at that time, but it was the law, and it had its application entirely upon the formation of this corporation.

Senator STERLING. You say that a law was enacted. What do you mean by that?

Mr. TIGHE. It was passed by the membership of our organization in our national convention.

Senator STERLING. You mean, then—you do not mean that it was a law enacted by any legislature?

Mr. TIGHE. No, no; I am speaking now of the action of our organization so far as it relates to the corporation interest.

Senator STERLING. You would rather term it a rule or regulation?

Mr. TIGHE. It was not a rule. It was an obligation, because our organization is obligated to observe the laws, adopted by the national convention.

Senator STERLING. That is the law to you, is it?

Mr. TIGHE. What is that?

Senator STERLING. That is absolute law to you, is it?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, in a sense, as long as it does not conflict with the laws of the United States or the States or municipalities which govern us.

Under the laws of our organization notice was sent when there was a breakaway in the other divisions, by refusal to equalize the wages, notice was sent to the tin division, or the subsidiary company of the corporation manufacturing tin plate, that it would be necessary for us to comply with that provision unless some settlement was made. We held a conference with the representatives of the Steel Corporation, representing the different divisions, or subsidiary companies and the national executive board of our organization, of which, I, myself, was a member.

It was at this stage of the proceedings that the honorable judge appeared upon the scene, the gentleman who preceded me yesterday in his testimony. I did not see him but I understand from the conferees of the corporation that he was counseling them; that he was in the rooms in the Lincoln Hotel in Pittsburgh as counsel for them.

I want to say at this time, Senator, that I have the greatest personal respect in the world for the judge. I listened very attentively to what he had to say. With all due respect to him, and I speak advisedly, the statements made by him before you Senators fully convinced me that the information he imparted to you was not obtained from any practical knowledge that he possessed, not any first-hand evidence but simply statements made to him by foremen and superintendents

and others in his employ, because there is as much difference between the actual conditions existing in the industries, of which he has the honor to be the financial head and chairman, as there is distance between his offices in New York and the locations of the different industries.

I say that with all due respect to the honorable judge.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you going ahead and give us facts about conditions that substantiate your conclusions?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir. At that conference—and this will bring in evidence of the \$20,000,000 statement that I heard the honorable chairman mention the day before yesterday when he was questioning the gentleman who preceded me—at the conference in the Lincoln Hotel there was very much feeling displayed at times.

Senator STERLING. What was the date of that conference?

Mr. TIGHE. It was somewhere around the 15th of July, 1901.

At the close of one of our sessions much feeling was expressed and the next morning one of the high officials of the corporation, of the subsidiary companies of the corporation, a gentleman who, before the institution of the corporation had owned and operated a union mill, at which time he was very friendly to our organization, and a man whom the men admired and respected and who reciprocated that feeling on his side, called our president and a national trustee into one of the ante rooms and he said to them "For heaven's sakes"—this was what they reported to us—"For heaven's sake, can't we get a settlement here? Let us try by some means or other to arrive at some conclusion." On our side he was told—

Senator STERLING (interposing). When you speak of a meeting or session held there, was that a meeting of workmen, or were you referring to a conference?

Mr. TIGHE. A conference between the representatives of the Steel Corporation, the subsidiary companies of the Steel Corporation, and the national executive board of the Amalgamated Association of which I was a member.

We were trying to solve the problem of how to get together so that there would be no strike called.

In his statement to this committee he said: "For heaven's sake, let us get together"; and when told about the conditions he said:

Now, gentlemen, I want to tell you that if this comes to a breakaway the United States Steel Corporation has laid aside a fund of \$20,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was it said that?

Mr. TIGHE. I will give you the name privately. The reason for that is the gentleman is dead now, and would not be in any position to refute the statement, and I will give you his name in private afterwards. Twenty million dollars for the purpose of defeating the organization if it enters into this strike.

Senator STERLING. This is as it was reported to you?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir; by the president and trustee of our organization. They came back from the conference with that statement and reported it to us in private.

Senator McKELLAR. Who was that president?

Mr. TIGHE. Mr. T. J. Shaffer.

Senator STERLING. Is he still living?

Mr. TIGHE. Oh, yes, sir.



Senator STERLING. Is he here?

Mr. TIGHE. No, sir; I think he is in Toledo, if I am not mistaken.

Senator STERLING. And who was the other man?

Mr. TIGHE. John H. Morgan.

Senator STERLING. Is he here?

Mr. TIGHE. No; he is in Cambridge, Ohio.

The conference was deadlocked and we broke away. Immediately the strike began and the men were called out. But before the breakaway, I wish to make this one statement, Senators: The same claim was made at that time that has been made before you gentlemen at this time—that our organization did not represent a certain number of men; that the men did not want to belong to our organization; that they were averse to it, and we proposed to the conference that we would be willing to take a vote on the proposition, let the men in these mills vote as to whether or not they desired organization.

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Tighe, what we want to know is what the situation is now.

Mr. TIGHE. I know, and I am bringing it up to that. In this strike a large number of English-speaking people were again left out of the mills, and foreigners, as they have been called, were introduced into the works there. The strike was lost by the introduction of that element into the mills.

After this strike there was a distinct effort made on the part of our organization to cultivate what might properly be termed a business relationship. We recognized the strength of the corporation. We lost seven mills in that contest, seven mills that had formerly been union mills.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you mean by losing.

Mr. TIGHE. Every mill that they undertook to operate when they came to the settlement, they claimed the privilege of operating that mill as a nonunion mill. Even if they only had operating 1 set of rolls out of 10 sets, they claimed that mill, that they undertook to operate it, and that was the terms under which we had to capitulate. That only added to the conditions that were formerly in existence.

Senator STERLING. On the other hand, were you willing that they should be operated as union mills?

Mr. TIGHE. We were contending for an equalization of the wages to bring them up to our position. I want to say that as union mills we have never, so far as my knowledge goes, given any consideration to what appears to be the paramount question in this contest, so far as the corporation is concerned—the open and closed shop. We never had a closed shop.

Senator STERLING. That does not quite answer the question. Was it your contention, as against the case of the companies, that these shops or mills should be operated as union shops or mills.

Mr. TIGHE. Well, by signing the scale naturally they would be considered union mills; but, so far as being a closed mill, we never, in all the years of my experience, really had that as a doctrine.

Senator STERLING. Well, would not that be the effect of it, if you had them operated as union mills.

Mr. TIGHE. It never has been in the workings of our organization, and I expect to demonstrate that to you. The fight was lost, and we lost seven mills.

Senator STERLING. Do you mean by losing seven mills, that those seven mills were not unionized?

Mr. TIGHE. Were not unionized, and were subject to the different wage conditions that were existing in the other nonunion mills, and, as a consequence, a still greater menace to the union men, who were receiving much higher rate of wages.

Senator STERLING. The union men were not prevented from working in the mill?

Mr. TIGHE. Not at that time, I don't think; but they would have to work at a much less rate of wages than what they were receiving in the union mills, which, of itself, was sufficient to keep them from working there. This, as I said before, led up to the determination on our part to demonstrate a business relationship. We continued along that line until 1904, when the Carnegie Co., another subsidiary company, operating mills in Youngstown, Ohio—steel-hoop mills—after our scale had been signed by the Republic Iron & Steel Co. and other independent bar-iron companies, presented an individual scale.

Senator STERLING. Before you go on to that, what were the peculiarities of that business relationship under which you operated from 1901 to 1904?

Mr. TIGHE. In giving way to every request that was made by the subsidiary companies when they insisted upon it.

Senator STERLING. You term that the business relationship?

Mr. TIGHE. It was the only relationship we could have, because we recognized that if we opposed them it would lead to a struggle that would be as disastrous, perhaps, as the one we had passed through. In 1904 the Carnegie Co. demanded an individual scale, after we had a yearly scale signed with the other competing interests, that would completely revolutionize our whole, entire organization. It was accompanied with a reduction from 30 to 70 per cent in the wages of the men employed in that particular industry.

Senator STERLING. But was there something in the condition of the times then which would make it reasonable to have some reduction?

Mr. TIGHE. Not from the logical standpoint, Senator, because the Republic Iron & Steel Co., and all the independent companies of less capitalization, had signed our scale, making it possible for them to operate for the coming year without any reduction in the prices. This led to another strike, because we have a clause in our memorandum of agreement that where any deviations in the scale of wages are left by the organization to any one particular firm, the same would be given to all who do business with us, and you will realize that after we had the scale signed by a very large number of firms, and the men working under conditions, that for them to accept the conditions presented by the Carnegie Co. at that time would have destroyed our organization in its entirety. There was no alternative left to us but to call a strike. That strike lasted for 12 or 13 months, and during that period Youngstown, which has been spoken of here by one of the preceding witnesses, became inoculated with the same class of people. They imported this class of people for the purpose of breaking down and destroying the wage system of our organization.

Senator McKELLAR. You say "imported." What do you mean by that?

Mr. TIGHE. I mean they had every employment agency in the surrounding counties gathering up men, bringing them into Youngstown to operate those mills.

Senator McKELLAR. You did not mean import them from abroad?

Mr. TIGHE. I did not mean to import them from abroad; no.

Senator STERLING. Did this last strike result in the closing of the Carnegie Mills?

Mr. TIGHE. It resulted in the closing of our mills, mills under our jurisdiction, for a long period, until they began to operate under nonunion conditions.

Senator STERLING. How many mills were at that time affected? How many were closed?

Mr. TIGHE. There were only two mills under our jurisdiction—three—two mills; but it eliminated every vestige of our organization, that strike did, from that subsidiary company's action. It was either then or in 1901—I am not positive—that we had one plant in Mingo under our jurisdiction; and I make mention of that fact now because the honorable judge read a newspaper article in which he stated that there had been a strike right in Mingo in which Mr. James Betell was prevented from speaking. Mr. James Betell's brother, Thomas, who is dead now, unfortunately—Mr. James Betell at one time was a prominent member of our organization; he is close to 70 or 80 years of age, I suppose, at the present time, and is engaged in the insurance business down there. Thomas Betell, his brother, has the charter of old Mingo Lodge No. 22 still in his house; and after the strike of either 1901 or 1904 he came to the national office himself and appealed to me, with tears in his eyes, to allow the men in the Mingo junction plant to send in their charter to the national lodge, because the corporation had closed down that plant and would not operate it as long as it had a union charter.

I, of course, refused. I was assistant secretary. I had the sending out—I had certain powers and privileges accorded me, and I explained to him that, as a national official, it would be absolutely impossible for us to consent to his returning the charter; that that was entirely within the province of the men themselves.

Senator STERLING. He wanted to surrender the charter in order that the men might go back to work?

Mr. TIGHE. Go back to work and the mill would resume operations.

Senator STERLING. I see.

Mr. TIGHE. And, in place of surrendering their charter, he took the charter home with him, so I have been informed. I have never seen the charter afterwards, but a short time afterwards the plant resumed operations. We never heard anything from any of the members of Mingo Lodge from that day up to the present campaign.

Senator STERLING. Their obligations under their charter were such as to prevent their return to work unless the charter was surrendered?

Mr. TIGHE. They felt that way, that they would be compelled.

Senator STERLING. However much they might desire to do it, or however much a particular organization might desire to return to work, your constitution and laws were such as to prevent their returning to work unless the charter was surrendered?

Mr. TIGHE. Under those conditions that were existing at that time. Under those conditions that were existing at that time we could not advise them to return the charter.

Senator STERLING. Just one question.

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Do you not think that that was rather arbitrary and that it was producing or calculated to produce unnecessary distress in certain localities or at certain mills where the men, as you say this old man, appealed to you to surrender the charter in order that the men might go back to work—don't you think it was arbitrary and calculated to produce distress among those workmen to refuse to permit them to return that charter?

Mr. TIGHE. We could not do it any more than we could permit the surrender of the constitutional rights of an American citizen in this great country of ours. They had the privilege themselves of taking that action, but as a national official I could not advise them to take that action.

Senator WALSH. They could have surrendered the charter?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. But you had nothing to do with that?

Mr. TIGHE. We had nothing to do with that.

Senator WALSH. But you could not, as an officer, advise the surrender of the charter?

Mr. TIGHE. No, sir. That is, they could not ask me to give them the privilege of doing that.

Senator STERLING. What I want to get at is this: The effect of your refusal to permit them to surrender their charter was to refuse to permit the men to go back to work.

Mr. TIGHE. We could not advise the men. That was optional with them. We said that as long as the charter was there that the men could not operate the plant. It was up to the men to determine what they should do in the matter. That eliminated the last vestige of the organization from that particular subsidiary company, and left us then only about seven mills manufacturing sheet and tin plate doing business with the subsidiary company of the United States Steel Corporation. Our relations were continued with the company up until 1909.

Senator STERLING. What do you mean by that statement "your relations with the company"?

Mr. TIGHE. Contracts were signed by those seven mills, and we did our business with them in the ordinary business way that organizations and employers do their business. Every year we signed a contract with them for these seven mills—a wage-scale contract.

Senator WALSH. Can you at some stage of these proceedings show us what progress was made in bettering the conditions of the workmen as to wages and as to hours of labor and other conditions by your various contracts?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, Senator.

Senator WALSH. Not now, but sometime during the proceedings.

Mr. TIGHE. I will be glad to do it.

Senator WALSH. In other words, if you have any evidence that your organizing the men in these years past bettered their condition, shortened their hours of labor, and improved sanitation we would like to have it.

Mr. RUBIN. Before you were here, Senator, he stated that they led the procession in the increase of wages and not the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; in the strike of 1910—and this has a history with it which bears distinctly upon what I term the business relationship between us. In our desire to be friendly, to try as best we could to cultivate that business relationship, we incurred a suspicion among our own members in those plants that we had become nothing but a mutual admiration society because we had conceded to the subsidiary companies every demand that they made. Our members made open boast of the fact that they would refuse to pay dues into an organization that did not have any more initiative than our organization had; that the officers were simply drawing their salaries and shaking hands with the corporation, and so forth and so on, like that. There was a feeling of distrust, and it lessened our membership. We could not satisfy those men that it was our desire to preserve them, that our actions were guided entirely by a desire to prevent an open rupture of any character.

Senator STERLING. You mean you could not tell them that, or you could not convince them?

Mr. TIGHE. Well, we could not go out and tell them, because it would become broadspread that we were afraid of the corporation, and you know among men that would not have sounded very nice for a labor organization.

Senator STERLING. So you did not endeavor to reconcile the men?

Mr. TIGHE. We could not reconcile them unless we could show by initiative something that would be antagonistic to this company that we were doing business with.

Senator STERLING. Was that quite general or was it confined to comparatively a few of what you might term radicals or extremists?

Mr. TIGHE. No; it became general, because our membership was reduced to a considerable extent in the seven mills, with one exception, and that one exception was this: In Cambridge, Ohio, we had an organization of about 97 per cent. Through some means or other, there were two or three men sent down from the Vandergrift mill, who were pronounced nonunionists, to work in that plant. Those men, feeling that they were secure in their position, scoffed and ridiculed the men in the plant, would not join the organization, would not comply with any of the conditions surrounding them, and the result was that the men became very much dissatisfied and they wanted to quit work, to force those men to do one thing or another. Our national executive board was called in session and we refused to grant the request of the men.

Senator STERLING. You say to do one thing or the other. That was to join the union or get out?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes. We refused to grant the request of the men, and that mill, when the strike was called, was the only mill that refused to obey the demands of the strike call, because they said that if the national executive board was willing to allow them to work with that class of men previous to the strike—that was the reason they gave—they could work with them after the strike.

The gentlemen who proceeded me stated that there was only one mill in Bridgeport and that the men there had requested that they sever their connections with the organization. I am sorry to have to say what I said before, that it only demonstrates that he did not

have first-hand knowledge of what he was speaking about. We had two mills in Newcastle, the largest tin mills in this country at that time. We had at Martins Ferry two mills. We had in Wheeling one mill. We had in Elwood, Ind., one mill, and we had in Cambridge one mill—seven mills all told.

Senator PHIPPS. Those were mills under the ownership of the steel corporation subsidiaries?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; of the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co., a subsidiary company.

Senator PHIPPS. In that connection, about how many independent mills did you have under your wage scale?

Mr. TIGHE. Oh, I would not be able at this time, Senator, to give a detailed number of them, because I came here unprepared, not knowing just exactly what I would be called upon to give information about, and I have got to depend largely upon my memory.

Senator PHIPPS. Let me put it this way, as a matter of information, and I think you can perhaps give us an approximation. Did you have as many members employed in independent mills as you had members employed in the steel corporation mills?

Mr. TIGHE. Oh, a great many more.

Senator PHIPPS. A great many more. That is what I wanted to get.

Mr. TIGHE. A great many more, because we had signed contracts with the independent mills. Now, I want it distinctly understood that we have never asked anything of the steel corporation that was not complied with by the independents. With the notice of June 1, 1909, notices were posted in these seven mills announcing that after June 30, which was the expiration of our scale contract year, that those mills would be run as what they termed open shops, without any scale contracts. Immediately those men who had been indifferent, who had become negligent in the organization work, saw the light. They saw then that the officials were not doing business along the lines that they thought they did and appeal after appeal came into the national organization to immediately get busy and try to prevent the culmination of that order. Foremen went around through the mills—and I make that statement so you will thoroughly understand that they do not understand the situation at the present time—they went around through the mills and they asked the membership, "Are you going to work on July 1? Are you going to work on July 1?" and from what reports I received those foremen reported that at least 90 per cent of the men were going to report for work on July 1 in those mills that we formerly had contracts in. Yet, Senators, due to the activity of our organization, as well as to the inclination of the men to redeem themselves for their indifference, on the 1st day of July, when the whistle blowed, not a single man entered those plants to perform his daily vocation, outside of the mill in Cambridge, which, as I have already stated, refused to comply with the order by reason of the fact that we would not enforce what our honorable friend has termed the closed shop.

Accompanying our notice was a reduction in wages.

Senator STERLING. Just a word before you proceed further. Was the distinct issue at that time in 1909 the open or closed shop?

Mr. TIGHE. So far as the corporation was concerned, but as you will readily understand that we had not insisted at any time upon a closed shop from the fact, as I have stated, that a large part of our people were not dues-paying men at that time, and had dropped out of the organization by reason of the fact that we were not taking an aggressive initiative attitude toward the corporation.

Senator STERLING. But the fight was brought about by the announcement by the company that after June 30, 1909, they would not recognize the closed shop.

Mr. TIGHE. That after June 30, 1909, they would not recognize the union in any respect.

Senator STERLING. But I want to know exactly whether or not that was the exact notice, that they would not recognize the union in any respect?

Mr. TIGHE. There is no other construction that can be put upon it.

Senator STERLING. Have you a copy of that notice?

Mr. TIGHE. I can give you a copy from our records. I have not got it with me, but I can give you a copy of the letter sent to Mr. Davis, the first vice president of the subsidiary corporation, our president asking for a conference on the very day that those notices were posted; President P. C. McArdle sent a letter to Mr. Davis in the Frick Building at Pittsburgh asking for a conference to negotiate a scale for the coming year. A short while afterwards he received a letter or a reply from the president of the company that the notice posted in the mills was sufficient evidence that they did not desire to transact any business with them.

Senator STERLING. In any event the strike, taking your own construction of it, was due to the fact that the companies had given notice that they would not deal with the unions as such.

Mr. TIGHE. That is it.

Senator STERLING. There was no attempt made to prevent the union men from working?

Mr. TIGHE. Unless they expected this reduction in wages, which was another menace, not only to the men working in the union mills but also to the employers of men in the independent plants who had to compete in the market with this corporation.

Senator STERLING. Now, was there an announcement made at that time that there would be any reduction in wages?

Mr. TIGHE. I stated, Senator, it was accompanied by a reduction of the wages of the pin workers of three and one-half per cent, and in the sheet mills for rollers, heaters, and shear men two and forty-five one-hundredths per cent.

This strike was the most notable in the history of the steel industry, and I desire to place in the record, and for the edification of the Senators here, a notice appearing in the Gazette-Times of Pittsburgh and an editorial published on that notice by the Pittsburgh Leader, a reputable newspaper of Pittsburgh, which in my judgment will convince the Senators that the claim against the foreigners is somewhat out of order. I will put it in here. This notice in the Gazette-Times reads this way.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that?

Mr. TIGHE. July 15 is the date of the notice, I think, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. What year?

**Mr. TIGHE.** 1909. The editorial was printed in the Pittsburgh Leader on July 16, 1909. It says:

"A crime" is the heading of the editorial. The advertisement reads this way:

*Men wanted.*—Tinnerns, catchers, and helpers to work in open shops, Syrians, Poles, and Roumanians preferred. Steady employment and good wages to men willing to work. Fare paid and no fees charged.

I will read the editorial, because I think it is important:

The above advertisement appeared in trust newspapers of Pittsburgh under the caption, "Men wanted." God pity America if the country has come to this!

That advertisement is an insult to every man through whose veins courses the rich American blood.

The man, or men, or corporation, responsible for these words is more insolent than the despicable puppet who dares to spit upon the Stars and Stripes. Each word is immersed in venom and hurled at American manhood.

Do you free-born, honorable men of America grasp the full meaning of this insidious advertisement?

The sons of the Republic can starve as long as enough foreigners can be secured to do the work of these capitalists.

That birth certificate granted to you by the fathers who shed their blood in 1776 and 1861 will bar you from the mills of those who profess to be captains of American industry.

Your allegiance to the flag and love for the mother country place you in the "not wanted" class of these capitalists who prefer to give work to foreigners.

The very blood of which you boast, of which poets sing, and which orators and statesmen throughout the world praise, will prevent you from earning a livelihood at the rolls and furnaces in the mills of these greedy employers.

What employer would dare sign his name to such an advertisement in the public press?

Not the employer who is ousting American union men. Oh, no!

But the insulted people who see that advertisement will know who wants to employ Syrians, Poles, and Roumanians in preference to Americans.

The Steel Trust wants foreigners to work in its mills.

The American Sheet & Tin Plate Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, declared its sheet and tin mills "open shops" this month.

Union men refused to work unless the billion-dollar combination recognized their combination of labor.

They are out of jobs now and the trust is filling their places with what they call strike breakers.

This grasping, greedy combination of wealth prefers to employ foreigners.

Why? Is it easier to grind foreign bodies and souls into dividends? Does this gigantic monopoly fear that the sons of the brave men who won freedom for the country and preserved and protected it will rebel against oppression?

And this is the same trust that pleaded for tariff laws which would protect the American laborer.

What hypocrisy!

This is the trust which appealed to the American people, the American lawmakers, the American Congress for protection for the American workingman.

With those pleas still ringing in the ears of the country, the steel trust arrogantly kicks the American out of its mills.

It insolently announces through the public press that it will give preferment to Syrians, Poles, and Roumanians in filling the vacancies in its plants.

To New Castle and those other towns where American workmen have manned the mills a foreign horde is invited.

The CHAIRMAN. What paper was that in?

Mr. TIGHE. The Pittsburgh Leader.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you read the full text of the advertisement?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Where were the men to apply for this employment? I did not catch that.



**Mr. TIGHE.** It does not tell where they were to apply. It says:

Steady employment and good wages to men willing to work. Fare paid and no fees charged.

But then I will say that every employment agent in the county of Allegheny were employed at that time in trying to secure men to man these mills. They did not have to apply; it was not necessary for them to apply at any stage but the employment agent, and I think that the corporation at that time had an employment agency, but I am not sure.

**Senator PHIPPS.** What have you there to connect that up with any subsidiary company of the United States Steel Corporation?

**Mr. TIGHE.** Well, there was no other demands made at that time for that class of labor, there was no other openings for that class of labor, and it was understood, and well understood, that there was no other place, and they did not care to sign it, just as this editorial says they did not dare to sign their names to it. It was so obnoxious to every sentiment of public interest and of Americanism that they did not dare to sign their names. But they had these employment agencies.

It goes on to say:

Look upon Schoenville, the "Hunkeyville" of the Pressed Steel Car Co., and you can see what the Steel Trust would make of those thriving American towns built around its mills and furnaces.

It would drive the Americans from those towns. It would fill its mills with foreign men who can be reduced to the state of animals and converted into beasts of burden.

The Steel Trust is right in one assumption. It could never reduce American men to the state in which the employees of the Pressed Steel Car Co. are found in Schoenville.

The American is no slave. Nor can he be purchased, body and soul, for 10 or 12 cents an hour. He will not stand idle and see his wife and children grovel in poverty and beg for the crumbs which fall from the employer's table.

Syrians, Poles, and Roumanians may be clubbed and driven and fed with the slop and swill their pitiful wages will purchase.

But the American can never be reduced to that state of desperation where his spirit is killed and his heart is broken.

The Steel Trust is not advertising for men to fill humble positions. It wants skilled workmen. But preference is to be given to the foreigners.

The so-called muckraker has pointed to Schoenville and the other sore and festering spots in the Pittsburgh district.

Pittsburgh, with natural pride, rebelled against exaggerated criticism.

But if it had a thousand tongues each should repeat from the house tops the words of this advertisement so that every American in the country might know that he, his flag, his children, and the parents who gave him birth have been brazenly insulted by this insolent trust.

In Washington there sits a Congress, the representatives of the American people. In the White House there is a man, William H. Taft, in whom Americans have placed their trust and confidence.

If these statesmen have ears let them hear the insulting words the Steel Trust spits into the face of the American workman.

Let those men, in whose hands the people have placed the destiny of their fair land, know that this pulling infant they coddle and nourish, is a hydra-headed monster spewing words of insolence upon Americans and the brain and brawn of the republic. And if these men in Washington do not believe their ears, let them use their eyes. Let them look at the sore spots, the Poverty Rows, where there should be settlements of men and their families living like decent Americans. Or let them focus their eyes upon the red flag flaunted in the faces of American workmen when they are told that Syrians, Poles and Roumanians are preferred in the mills of the trust. If there is that much vaunted spirit in the breasts of the republic's sons it will rebel against the trust which places the American beneath the most ignorant foreigner who comes to America's shores.

"All men are created equal."

Let it be so. Give the foreigner his opportunity. But God pity the country if preference is to be given to the ignorant foreigner lifted from oppression in which he and his forefathers dwelt and enticed to the "land of promise" to be reduced to greater poverty than Europe has ever known.

America for Americans.

The Steel Trust seems to be for neither.

I have copies of those and I am perfectly willing to allow the Senators to have copy of it.

Mr. REED. Let me request that the committee ask the witness if there has been anything secured to show that the Steel Corporation had anything to do with that advertisement.

Mr. RUBIN. There is no doubt that it paid for the advertisement.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who paid for the advertisement?

Mr. TIGHE. No, but I do know this, that every agency that could possibly be employed in that contest, which was a life and death contest with us, was exerted, and every effort that possibly could be made to line up the men that went out and to organize the mills on a nonunion basis was made. It was a life and death struggle with us, and so far as the corporation was concerned they had private detectives following the footsteps of our officers every place they went. They did not move outside of their offices that they were not followed by detectives. Now, I do not say, gentlemen, that the heads of the Steel Corporation were altogether conversant perhaps with this activity. I do not know anything about that.

Senator STERLING. Where were you located at this time, in 1909?

Mr. TIGHE. In the National offices in Pittsburgh, Pa., where our national offices were, in the House Building, room 502-506, and we could look out of the window and we could see the detective stationed—we knew them—in front of the Monongahela House.

Senator WALSH. As I look up this copy, I find it is not a copy of the advertisement, but is a copy of the editorial, and at the head of the editorial, as a part of the editorial, is this portion of the advertisement that you read.

Mr. TIGHE. That is the entire advertisement, Senator, just as it is.

Senator WALSH. I thought this was the editorial.

Mr. TIGHE. The latter part is the editorial, but that in the black letters in the box is the advertisement.

Senator WALSH. Is that the heading of the editorial?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir; that is the heading of the editorial.

Senator WALSH. And was that advertisement reprinted at the head of the editorial?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator WALSH. So that what you have read was the whole editorial which includes an abstract of the advertisement in question.

Mr. RUBIN. And it appeared in all the papers the day preceding?

Mr. TIGHE. That, of course, eliminated the organization from any contractual relationship with the company.

Senator WALSH. And do you make the charge that from this date on there has been a steady and constant increase in the number of foreign employees in the mills of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And that was the beginning of the turning of the employees there from American citizens to foreign citizens.

Mr. TIGHE. In the sheet and tinplate mills. I just want to show that there—that the strikers' places were taken by people who were largely composed of non-English speaking people; they were displaced by men who were brought in there in trainloads to fill those positions. This strike continued for 14 months, and it cost us or our organization more than a quarter of a million dollars, which would show that it was not any one mill engaged.

Senator STERLING. Would that strike have resulted from the announcement of the corporation that they would not deal with the union after June 30, 1909? Would it have resulted from that announcement alone without any reference to any reduction in wages?

Mr. TIGHE. I could not just answer that, Senator, for the simple reason that the men were not allowed to work when there was no reduction in wages. It would be a matter that would have to be taken up by the men themselves. Our organization is a very democratic organization. The leaders do not intend to impose official orders upon them. We try to advise them as much as we can and try to prevent them from doing anything rash or anything of that kind, but so far as them being obedient to every order, that would be autocratic, that would be an autocracy and not a democracy. If the situation had become so acute, there is no doubt but what perhaps there might have been some measures adopted and determined upon, on the demand of the men working in those mills themselves, and the demand of these men when this order was put out was universal that they would not work without a contract being signed, because there is a social distinction in those matters.

Senator STERLING. The reduction of wages at that time was a very slight reduction, was it not?

Mr. TIGHE. But it would have meant a reduction in all of the independent plants as well. You can thoroughly understand that it did not only apply to them, but it would have applied to every plant that had contract signed with them. We would have had to reduce the wages of all our men. Then there was no assurance, you know, that the reduction would not have been still further advanced.

Senator STERLING. You think that would have followed. It would not necessarily have followed that there would have been a reduction.

Mr. TIGHE. I would have just as good a reason for thinking one way as I would the other way, Senator. Past experience has proved that in every instance where we had no contractual relations there had been very serious reductions, reductions of from 10 to 20 to 30 per cent in the wages of the men who had no contracts.

Senator STERLING. Do you think it probable that they would have struck on that announcement alone?

Mr. TIGHE. I can not answer that question and answer it truthfully.

Senator PHIPPS. Before the men went out on July 1, 1909, was there a strike vote taken; did the men themselves vote by ballot that they would go out on strike, or were they called out by the officers of your organization?

Mr. TIGHE. They were called out by the officers of our organization in compliance with our contracts with the other independent companies; but, in that same connection, with the full consent, approval, and demand of the men themselves.

Senator PHIPPS. How expressed? If they did not vote, how did they express their approval and demand for a strike?

Mr. TIGHE. By sending in to the national lodge and by meetings. We do not vote on those contractual relations, Senator, except through the conference adjustments that we make. In other words, we are doing business to-day with the Western Bar Iron Association, composed of independent bar iron manufacturers, and the Western Sheet & Tin Plate Manufacturers Association, composed of independent manufacturers of sheet and tin plate. We meet once a year in annual conference, and present to them our convention scale, the scale of wages made by the convention.

We discuss these propositions pro and con and finally reach an agreement. We had in that memorandum or agreement a clause that in case we allow any deviation from that scale we must give it to those who have other relations with us. Consequently, as a matter of self-preservation, when that scale has been agreed upon and decided upon by the representatives in convention and the powers delegated to the conference committee to make a complete turnover of that scale if necessary, that scale is a binding force upon every member of our organization until the expiration of the scale year, unless a special convention is called to overturn it.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you not get down to present conditions, Mr. Tighe?

Mr. TIGHE. I want to say now, Senator, and this brings me up to this very present position, that time and again appeals were made to us to organize these mills, by the men in the different mills who were working under the Steel Corporation. In some instances we tried to organize them, simply to satisfy the men, which will also demonstrate the fact that we were not strictly adhering to the closed shop proposition.

We had one or two organizations in the corporation plants, but, as has been stated, they are powerless to do anything. They are practically mutual admiration societies, as it were; they receive no recognition from the corporation or subsidiary companies. It is just that inborn spirit that exists in the breast of every human being to want to stand on the same plane socially and otherwise as his fellow workmen, that impels these men to try to belong to the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. How many workers are there in the steel mills who are members of your organization?

Mr. TIGHE. At the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TIGHE. Well, Senator, it would be absolutely impossible for me to give an estimate of the number, because I only have the total which has been given to me. I might say that since this campaign has started we have issued in the neighborhood of—there would be wide variation in these figures, because that is not in my line at the present time, but I will say from 50 to 100 charters, the secretary told me the other day.

Senator WALSH. In this campaign?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Which began when and went up to what date?

Mr. TIGHE. About last October, was it not, that the campaign really started?

Senator WALSH. So that between October and the present time you have issued between 50 and 100 charters?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. When you said a moment ago there were two organizations in those plants, did you mean they were the kinds of organizations of men to which Judge Gary referred?

Mr. TIGHE. In what way do you mean?

Senator WALSH. In some of those plants.

Mr. TIGHE. I did not say two organizations.

Mr. RUBIN. He said two locals.

Senator WALSH. I thought you said two organizations, but you did not?

Mr. TIGHE. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Do I understand that up to last October there were no organizations or unions in any of the plants of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. TIGHE. No; we had—oh, that is what you want to know?

Senator WALSH. Yes.

Mr. TIGHE. We had two or three small local organizations.

Senator WALSH. Were they connected with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. TIGHE. Through their affiliation with us. We are a constituent part of the American Federation of Labor.

Senator WALSH. You had two or three up to last October?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator WALSH. And from October to the present time you have issued from 50 to 100 charters?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Now; the chairman has asked you the number of men belonging to organizations, so far as you are able to tell us.

Mr. TIGHE. I can only state this, Mr. Chairman, that our secretary one day last week said that we could not print our dues cards fast enough; that he had already issued in the neighborhood of 150,000 due cards. Our reports only come in quarterly. They come in the first of January, the first of April, the first of July, and the first of October. Consequently, the reports had not been compiled as to the actual number of members that have been taken in in this campaign.

Senator PHIPPS. You have, however, have you not, a monthly financial statement?

Mr. TIGHE. No, Senator; quarterly.

Senator PHIPPS. But your records show the dues received each month?

Mr. TIGHE. No, Senator, our due system is worked in this way: our laws provide that each member pays in to the national organization \$2.75 every quarter. The subldge collects its own dues and has jurisdiction over its own members, so far as that is concerned. We only get their report of the number of members in each subldge and the amount of money, with the names of the members, at the end of each quarter.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there not an initiation fee charged when the charter is taken out; when a man joins the union is there not an initiation fee paid in addition to the quarterly rate for membership?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; there is, but at times that initiation fee does not come in until the quarterly report. There is a certain amount paid for the charter.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the amount of the initiation fee?

Mr. TIGHE. In this campaign they have only charged \$2 initiation fee—it is \$3, but \$1 goes to the campaign committee to pay the expenses of the campaign committee, and \$2 goes to the national organization.

Senator McKELLAR. As I understood him, Judge Gary said that the Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries had 260,000 employees. How many of those men are now in your organization?

Mr. TIGHE. That would be absolutely impossible for me to say.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your best judgment, as to how many there are, from what information you have?

Mr. TIGHE. Really, I could not even give an estimate of that, by reason of the fact that the campaign has been so extensive and has taken in so many men—

Senator McKELLAR. Could you not get those figures and give them to us, in answer to that question?

Mr. TIGHE. Not until the quarterly reports would come in.

Senator McKELLAR. It seems to be a matter of some importance. Can you not get those figures?

Mr. TIGHE. I recognize that. I have here figures of October 1 of the estimate of the number of men out in the steel workers' strike.

Senator WALSH. Will you read those to us, class by class?

Mr. TIGHE. The estimated number of men out is:

Pittsburgh.....	25,000
Homestead.....	9,000
Braddock.....	10,000
Rankin.....	5,000
Clairton.....	4,000
Duquesne-McKeesport.....	12,000
Vandergrift.....	4,000
Brackenridge.....	5,000
New Kensington.....	1,100
Apollo.....	1,500
Leechberg.....	3,000
Donora-Monessen.....	12,000
Johnstown.....	18,000
Coatesville.....	4,000
Youngstown district (Hubbard, Lorain, Struthers, Canton, Alliance, Massillon, New Philadelphia, Sharon, Farrell, Butler, New Castle)...	70,000
Wheeling district.....	15,000
Cleveland district.....	25,000
Steubenville district.....	12,000
Chicago district (Gary, South Chicago, Indiana Harbor, East Chicago, Hammond, Evanston, Waukegan, Milwaukee, Sterling, De Kalb, Joliet).....	90,000
Buffalo.....	12,000
Pueblo.....	6,000
Five Bethlehem plants.....	20,000
Total.....	363,600

Senator McKELLAR. That is for the whole steel industry without regard to the Steel Corporation?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What is the date of that?

Mr. TIGHE. October 1.

Senator WALSH. How authentic is that? Who made that estimate?

Mr. TIGHE. It came from the organization campaign-committee office, Senator. I haven't any specific figures——

Senator WALSH (interposing). Do you know how many of the men there are in the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiary companies?

Mr. TIGHE. I think the larger portion of them are.

Senator WALSH. The larger portion of them?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; there is no question about that.

Senator McKELLAR. There seems to be some sharp conflict about that. Won't you have some one look into the situation and get the figures for us?

Mr. TIGHE. We will try to do the best we can. Everything at the present time is somewhat chaotic by reason of the fact that they are coming in in such large numbers that it is absolutely impossible to really get down to immediate figures on that. In other words, we sent our assistant secretary to the Labor Temple in Pittsburgh the other day to sort out 4,000 applications, to try to make a segregation of the iron workers, the machinists, and the other different crafts, the different members belonging to the 24 other international organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us an estimate of how many of those men who are out on strike can not speak the English language?

Mr. TIGHE. There is a good proportion of them, I think, Senator, but I do not think there is as large a proportion as what the average person has any knowledge of. A large number of them can speak a smattering of it and can understand, you know.

Senator McKELLAR. What percentage would you say were American citizens? First, how many would you say were native American citizens?

Mr. TIGHE. I would be unable to figure that unless I had the records, Senator. I could not begin to figure it.

Senator McKELLAR. Is the percentage large or small?

Mr. TIGHE. Well, to be perfectly frank in the matter, that the percentage of foreigners is larger than of Americans.

Senator WALSH. By that you mean the percentage of men who speak in their homes a foreign language, who speak in their clubs a foreign language, who speak to their children a foreign language, and who speak at church a foreign language is larger than of those that speak in those places named the English language?

Mr. TIGHE. That is my impression.

Mr. RUBIN. May I interrupt to say something in regard to that answer about the United States Steel Corporation? I have just been informed that if you exclude from the United States Steel Corporation the miners who are not on strike and the office employees not on strike, and the coal miners not on strike that at least 80 per cent of the mill workers are affected by the strike. In other words, it is an 80 per cent strike so far as the United States Steel Corporation is concerned.

Senator WALSH. You mean by affected that 80 per cent of the employees are involved, or 80 per cent of the men out on strike?

Mr. RUBIN. Eighty per cent of the men out on strike in the departments in which the strike was declared.

Mr. TIGHE. I must apologize for keeping you gentlemen here as long as we have, but at the same time I consider the statements made

by Judge Gary yesterday a direct reflection, in a sense, upon the work of our organization. He took the position that the United States Steel Corporation was the advance agent for all that was virtuous and gives credit to no other institution than that. I would not be doing justice to our people, I would not be doing justice to the American Federation of Labor, of which our organization is a constituent part, if I did not undertake at least to have placed in the record contradictory statements from those which he has made. I mean no reflection whatever upon the honorable gentleman, but I want to say that in strikes at all time—and we all deplore them, no one more so than I do—they are at no time in my judgment productive of what might be termed the best evidence of civilization—but there have been instances in the history and life of our organization very harrowing.

We have striven as best we could, as honorable trade-unionists, American citizens, men who love their country and revere its institutions—and I yield to no man in my allegiance to my country and its flag, and all that it carries with it. I deplore violence just as much as any man. I recognize that a strike of any proportion is just exactly what Gen. Sherman said that war was, but there are instances where we try to conduct peaceful strikes, where the corporation officials use just exactly the same tactics that is used by what, as they call them, the vicious element; and I want to protest against any connection whatever, any resemblance of a vicious element in either our organization or in the American Federation of Labor. I want to protest against any such appellation as that, any such insinuation, that the American Federation of Labor or that our organization is in any way encouraging or having any connection with a vicious element.

In the strikes which we have had with the corporation we have suffered violence, and we had to bear with it in Vandergraft in 1909. We sent four organizers up there. They were not allowed to stay in Vandergraft. They were deprived of their American rights, and their own manager, so it was reported to us on the following morning, Mr. Lindquist, appeared at the Park Hotel, where they had to go, over across the Kiskaminikas River, in Armstrong County, with a band of thugs, and demanded that the hotel proprietor turn those organizers out to the crowd, and the proprietor stood at his desk and pulled a revolver and said "If you take one step inside that door you are a dead man; these are my guests."

Another instance: Mr. Lewis, the vice president, went up there one time to pass some bills on them, in the case of a strike, calling attention to what the issues were. He was assaulted and driven out. Time and again when some of the former workmen who would come with the men went up there to see if they could not talk organization with those men, they were told very plainly by the merchants, even, that the sooner they got on the train and got out of the vicinity the better it would be for them. Those are the conditions.

Senator STERLING. Was the strike on at that time?

Mr. TIGHE. At times it was, and at other times it was not.

Senator STERLING. At this particular time, when these men were there seeking to organize?



Mr. TIGHE. At that time the strike was on, yes. I simply make mention of that fact to demonstrate that the corporation alone does not indulge in that, that independent plants have done the same thing.

Senator STERLING. Would you think the fact that a strike was on at that time might in a measure justify this action on the part of other people in preventing these men from coming in to organize at that time?

Mr. TIGHE. Do I think that any man should be deprived of his rights of American citizenship? No, Senator, I do not.

Senator STERLING. Now, to go back a little further in my question—I prize American citizenship and the rights of every American, whatever his station, just as much as any man in the world, I think; but do you think those men, some of them, anyhow—I am not saying the man who went there with thugs, or anything of that kind—but do you think that some of them were inspired because the strike was on and there was a fear of violence if those men came there to organize them, that they had better prevent activities among the workmen in a time like that.

Mr. TIGHE. Why, even crossing the Kiskaminikas River and going into another county and demanding of the proprietor of the hotel that he turn those men over to them—would that be in accord with the customs of a country such as ours?

Senator STERLING. No; I waived that, and I expressly said so.

Mr. TIGHE. Another instance, Senator, which has no bearing on the corporation, but at Port View, county of Allegheny, which was at one time designated by our martyred President as the state of Allegheny, and I don't know but what it ought to be characterized now as the state of isolation so far as labor organizations are concerned, outside the city of Pittsburgh, in McKeesport, appeals were made year before last to send some one up there to organize them, and we sent three reputable citizens from Canonsburg, tin-plate workers, fellow craftsmen, and they were assaulted. The report of our national president to the convention will give you an idea of it:

Efforts have been made for some time past to interest the employees of the McKeesport Tin Plate Co. in the cause of unionism, but it remained for representatives of Canonsburg lodge, who had heard the macedonia cry to bring the issue in that loss-ridden city, to a climax.

Herculean efforts were made by these brothers—White, Cook, and Murray—to get the men together, which they succeeded in doing, but in the interim the interests got busy with the powers that be which resulted in Mayor Lysle, of McKeesport, taking the un-American procedure of refusing to grant a permit to hold a meeting.

In the meantime the officers of the company, hearing of the meeting, got the owners of the building to prevent the gathering by having an alderman issue a restraining order to prevent the meeting, on the grounds that it was not the day that the trades assembly met on. Stone, the superintendent of the company and his henchmen, were on hand and did everything in their power to incite the organizers by calling them the names and going so far as striking one of them in the face. The A. A. men, however, kept their heads and did not fall into the trap set for them by the president of that company.

It is about time that the issue be settled, whether or not McKeesport municipal officials can ruthlessly prevent workmen from exercising the right of assembly and free speech. The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of North America is going to push that issue to the bitter end. Industrial Prussianism must be put on trial. Supt. Stone, of Port Vue, is industrially using the same vile tactics against organized labor that the Kaiser is using against democratic nations. Our country is fighting to make the world

safe for democracy. The Amalgamated Association is striving to make the mill towns of our country safe for industrial democracy. McKeesport is the place to demonstrate whether it can be done or not. To deny men the right assembly and free speech industrially, must be determined in McKeesport, now that the Port Vue Co. has thrown down the gage for industrial Prussianism.

We took up the matter with District Attorney Hume, and he sent for the mayor and every effort was made by the officials of the Government to try to convince him that he was wrong, but he still held to that position, and the letter that here follows tells that they got a charter for the lodge there, took the charter up there, and the mayor sent for them when he heard they had gotten a charter and gave them 24 hours to leave the town.

Senator STERLING. When was that?

Mr. TIGHE. That was a year before this organizing campaign was started, and I bring that to your attention for the express purpose of demonstrating to you gentlemen the impossibility of anyone of any one particular labor organization undertaking to organize the workmen in any of those plants, no matter how desirous those workmen may be to have an organization.

Senator STERLING. I think your statement assumes this—and you may be right. I am not deciding—but you assume that the so-called organizers from outside, who go to places when a strike is on—

Mr. TIGHE. No strike was on then—

Senator STERLING. Not in your last instance, but you were speaking a while ago about their going to organize when a strike was on, and I called your attention specially to that. You seemed to assume that the organizers go there solely for the purpose of organizing a strike. Are you sure that they confine their activities always to the matter of organizing into unions the strikers, getting them to join the unions? Do they not sometimes encourage strikers to prevent other men from taking the place of strikers and from going to work in the mill from which the strikers have gone?

Mr. TIGHE. We can only speak from the advice that we give to them, that they must at all times preserve peace, that they must use moral persuasion at all times to prevent men from depriving them and their families of the right of existence.

Senator STERLING. That may be your advice, but do you know that it is always followed by your so-called organizers?

Mr. TIGHE. Do you know what the citizens in your community whom you have the honor to represent will always do? Do they follow your advice at all times, Senator?

Senator STERLING. I fear not. It is perhaps to be hoped that they do not.

Mr. TIGHE. Well, we can not answer hypothetical questions, you know, except by giving a hypothetical answer.

Senator STERLING. Exactly; but you know at the time of a strike there is more or less excitement, and the organizers, as you call them, might at such time overstep the bounds and advise men to prevent others from taking the place of strikers.

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; and, on the other hand, I have found innumerable cases where the element that they bring in to break strikes, who are the rag-tag, the scums of the country, provoke strife for the express purpose of trying to create the very condition that you have stated.

Senator STERLING. Do you deny the right of any of them to go to work, do you deny the right of freedom to contract to any of them, whomsoever they may be, that go to that particular mill or plant and desire to go to work there?

Mr. TIGHE. We never deny the right of anybody, but we do deny the right of men to go into a community for the express purpose of creating riots—

Senator STERLING. You call them the rag-tag and bobtail?

Mr. TIGHE. That is what they are.

Senator STERLING. "Scab" is a frequently used term.

Mr. TIGHE. I do not use that word, because I sometimes find that the nonunion man of to-day is the strong union man of to-morrow. I never use that opprobrious epithet, Senator.

I want to say to you, the question has been asked or has been elucidated that large numbers of Americans did not join in the strike. That may be true, but there is also a sequel to that, and that is this, that a large number of those men in former years have been members of our organization. They have been defeated time and time again; they have suffered every privation that it is possible for men to suffer; and the fear, that inborn fear, that they would have to go through the same condition again has in my judgment impelled a great many of them to hold back in this contest.

Senator STERLING. Is that true of the skilled laborers, such as rollers, that are getting \$20 a day?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir; that is true, and those are the ones, if any, that are holding on at the present time, and they are holding on through fear.

Senator STERLING. Men that receive pay of that kind, are they inspired by fear against joining the strike, or is fair treatment and the wage they are getting the inducement for them to remain?

Mr. TIGHE. There is no treatment that can be accorded them that will come up to the treatment that will be guaranteed them under the laws of our organization.

Senator STERLING. Is that the reason you assign for their not striking?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; because it is a human desire, Senator, to at all times receive as good treatment as it is possible for a human being to receive.

Senator PHIPPS. Do we understand from your statement that for the reasons given by you, your recent efforts to organize the men into unions have been limited to the so-called foreign element, largely?

Mr. TIGHE. Let me understand that question again, Senator.

Senator PHIPPS. Because of the statements you have made, the former experience of American workmen who have gone through previous strikes, that this movement which is now under way and has been for over a year has been largely limited to the so-called foreign element? That is, your main effort has been to organize the foreigners rather than the American workmen?

Mr. TIGHE. There never has been any distinction made in the trade-union movement in its organizing propaganda between white and black, foreign element or American born. We stand for the universal emancipation of the wageworker from a great number of the ills that the industry imposes upon him.

Senator PHIPPS. How do you account for the failure of your organizers to approach the American workmen who have testified here as never having been asked, over a period of years, to go back into the union, while we know that the foreigners have been asked?

Mr. TIGHE. Gentlemen, Senators—

Senator PHIPPS. Those statements have been made here.

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; I understand that, and it amused me when they were made, very much so, because there was not a scintilla of truth in them. One of the witnesses here testified that he had not been asked, and I know positively that he had been an officer in one of the organizations. Any American citizen, any man who has any intellect about him at all, knows that when an organizing campaign is going on, that his failure to come in—it does not specify anyone at all. There was no more effort made to organize the foreigners than there was the Americans. The propaganda was world-wide, so far as this country was concerned. All were invited to join in the movement. So that excuse you know, is nothing more nor less than an excuse.

One gentleman here testified about Duquesne. Do you know that the Burgess of Duquesne, Mr. Crawford, positively and emphatically proclaimed that under no circumstances and conditions would he allow any union organizers to hold any meetings in that place? He is a brother of a man that wrote the article that I have read here, another Crawford, president, a man who drove down in his limousine, jumped out, and walked over to our organizer and said, using a very vulgar adjective, "What are you doing here?" calling him every name that he could possibly conceive of, and dared him to hit him, but we had instructed our people under no circumstances to do anything.

Senator WALSH. When was this incident?

Mr. TIGHE. Over a year ago, long before this campaign was started, Senator.

Senator WALSH. Now, I would like to ask you this question. Is it not a fact that the workman who gets \$20 or \$30 a day and has a fixed trade in the steel industry, takes a greater risk and chance of losing his job by joining a union when he knows his employer is hostile to unions and he knows that his employer controls all the occupations to which he has devoted his life?

Mr. TIGHE. There is not any question, Senator, but what that is true.

Senator WALSH. The common laborer that gets a small wage can go into some other line of business or some other occupation or somewhere else, but the capable, specially trained, high priced, salaried man is left down on the street without anything?

Mr. TIGHE. Correct you are.

Senator WALSH. If he meets with the disfavor of his employer?

Mr. TIGHE. Correct you are. And it is that fear, as I said before, that they will be deprived of those positions, that they will be left as they have been left formerly and which brought about this influx of foreigners into these plants, in the case of a strike, that is the impelling fear at present that is keeping those men in that employment.

Senator STERLING. Do you find many of these skilled laborers among these foreigners? Is there not a greater proportion of those laborers among the American workmen?

Mr. TIGHE. That is a hard matter to determine. You see, there are so many grades of skilled labor. There is the roller, there is the heater, there is the rougher, there is the finisher, there is the catcher, and there are so many of these different men that come under that classification of skilled labor; but a large number of the lower-priced men, making fairly good wages, are foreigners. The high-priced men, a large number of them, are Americans, but they have been—Senator, let me explain to you. In former years they were members of our organization, when they had free access to the organization, when they were not imbued with that inward fear of losing their positions, they were only too willing to become members of our organization.

In all the independent plants that we do business with we have those classes of workmen in our organization. If the independent plants, which have not a capitalization of \$2,000,000,000, can contract with our organization and do business with it—and some of them have done business with it for over 30 years—why should not the Steel Corporation do the same thing? What grounds have they for taking the autocratic position that they can not compete with the independents, but that they must have special privileges which the independents do not want?

Senator STERLING. The object of this conference sought with Judge Gary was that he should recognize the closed shop. That was the main object.

Mr. TIGHE. Senator, Judge Gary mentioned my name in a very complimentary manner. He spoke of receiving a letter from me, and to demonstrate to you gentlemen that we were perfectly desirous of trying to bring about some effort of conciliation, because our organization stands for those two fundamental principles—conciliation and cooperation. Those are the two fundamentals of our organization. Our constitution provides that where a firm or company signs a contract with us, that the employee—and I sent a circular letter out at the time of this strike calling attention to that—that any company that we had a contract with, the members of our organization must hold that contract as a bond of honor, and our constitution says:

Every member shall interest himself, individually and collectively, in protecting his trade, and the business of all employers who recognize, negotiate, and are under contract with this association.

I called attention in that letter that these pledges must be kept inviolate, and I offer that as one of the evidences of our sincerity.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

NATIONAL LODGE, AMALGAMATED ASSOCIATION OF IRON,  
STEEL, AND TIN WORKERS OF NORTH AMERICA,  
*Pittsburgh, Pa., September 12, 1919.*

*To the membership of the A. A. of I., S. and T. W. of N. A.:*

BROTHERS: Your attention is called at this time to that part of our constitution and general laws which reads as follows:

#### ARTICLE XVII.

SECTION 1. Every member shall interest himself, individually and collectively, in protecting his trade, and the business of all employers who recognize, negotiate, and are under contract with this association.

The object in directing the attention of our membership to this particular law, bearing on our relations to fair-minded employers, is to prevent misunderstandings of any kind during the trying period now before us.

Our association has entered into contracts with many employers who recognize and treat with the association in its many functions. Those contracts are bonds of honor between men, and it becomes us to honor them as such.

The pledges given by the officials and representatives of both the manufacturers and our association, at Atlantic City, to hold these contracts inviolate, must be ever in the minds of our membership during this scale year.

The strict observance of these contracts on the part of our membership at this time will bring to them and to the association the credit that comes from fair dealing. It will also demonstrate to the world at large the benefits to be derived from the principle of collective bargaining, embodying the spirit of mutual cooperation.

Thousands of our members at this very time are preparing to make every sacrifice to secure for themselves the principle of collective bargaining. Let those of our membership who have that prize show by their fealty to that principle the benefits derived, by strict adherence to every feature of it.

Fraternally, yours,

M. F. TIGHE, *President.*

Senator PHIPPS. What was the date of the adoption of that policy by the Amalgamated Association?

Mr. TIGHE. At all times, Senator, where there have been contracts, we have always tried to uphold our contractual relations.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you not know that in 1892—and I regret to refer to the Homestead strike—

Mr. TIGHE. Refer to it.

Senator PHIPPS. That the Amalgamated Association had contracted with the Carnegie Steel Co. at two of its Pittsburgh city mills.

Mr. TIGHE. Or more.

Senator PHIPPS. Where the union scale had been accepted and signed up? The Homestead matter was in dispute, the Homestead workmen went on strike, and the contract made with the union mills in Pittsburgh was violated by calling out the workmen on a sympathetic strike. You know that.

Mr. TIGHE. I recognize that the plants in Beaver as well, Senator—I will aid you in that. There were other plants, the Twenty-ninth and Thirty-third Street mills, I recognize that too, but as to the actual breaking of the contract at that time, I have no knowledge of it. I could not say whether the conference committee at that time had entered into a specific agreement on those two mills. Relatively speaking, the interests were identical; it was the same company; they were going to crush one of their classes of workingmen, and the others I presume felt that their interest was identical in that particular industry.

Senator PHIPPS. That is a pretty broad term to say crush one class of their men.

Mr. TIGHE. That is what it was, nothing more and nothing less.

Senator PHIPPS. You made the statement that the Homestead strike involved a reduction in wages.

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you aware of the fact that the record will show that the wages paid the men after the settlement of the Homestead strike were increased, that the men made larger average earnings than they did before that period?

Mr. TIGHE. That may be true, and may be accounted for by the fact that they may have afterwards introduced machinery which increased the output but not the rate per ton. You see, Senators, under our organization system, so that you will thoroughly understand it, it is practically a profit-sharing proposition. Our men's wages are based on the selling price of the product. At that time the price for steel billets 4 by 4 was based on a \$25 rate, and they undertook to reduce the rate and there was a corresponding reduction in the wage rate. The price for puddling was based on a 2½-cent rate, and we have a sliding scale that as the rates increase our wages increase. As they go down to a minimum base, our wages go down without any interruption whatever. During the war period some of our men's wages were increased to the extent of 240 per cent without the stoppage of a single wheel in its revolution. Others were increased to over 100 per cent. So you see that the statements made here that the highest wages were paid in certain departments is not borne out. Our organization received the highest wages, because its wages are based upon an examination of the sales sheets of certain independent firms every 60 days, and that examination determines the wages of our employees for the next 60 days.

Senator WALSH. How do the wages in the independent steel shops compare with those in the United States Steel Corporation shops?

Mr. TIGHE. Well, so far as our knowledge goes, I am not prepared to say, only to this extent, that in the particular lines that we have now, after the 60-day examination has been made and the wages for men in the independent plants has been fixed, perhaps a few weeks afterwards the wages of the employees in the corporation comes up to them. They have to do that to retain their men now.

Senator WALSH. Comes up to what?

Mr. TIGHE. Comes up to the same rate that we have.

Senator WALSH. In the Steel Co.?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes. The Steel Co. brings their wages up to the same rate our men are receiving.

Senator WALSH. I understand you to say you have contracts with independent steel companies?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Will you state whether or not these companies are satisfied and are contented to make these contracts, or are they made under pressure?

Mr. TIGHE. I am glad you asked me that question, Senator, because it refreshes my memory.

Senator WALSH. Perhaps you might tell us how many there are of these independent companies that you have contracts with.

Mr. TIGHE. I suppose we have in the sheet and tin industry in the neighborhood of 20 or 25. In the bar-iron industry we have in the neighborhood of about 15 or 20. They are scattered all over the country, from Seattle, Wash., clean up into Sydney, Nova Scotia. Of course, all of these are not contracted with, but the Western Bar Iron Association and the Western Sheet & Tin Plate Manufacturers Association, we have contractual obligations with a large number of those men. The question you asked me about Senator—

Senator WALSH. Was whether or not these independent companies are now entering into, and have been for years past, contracts with your unions voluntarily and freely, or has it been accomplished

through pressure, and whether or not they are satisfied to continue this arrangement?

Mr. TIGHE. Our relationship with the independent companies has been of the most amiable and satisfactory character. We present our yearly scale of wages to them. We meet at Atlantic City, sit around the table, one on one side and the other on the other side, and we discuss these propositions. They are very frank and we are the same. At the expiration of our conference, which generally lasts four or five days, we agree, shake hands, and our relationship during the year is of the very best character all along the line.

But the reason I said I was glad you asked me that question is that it opened up an avenue of thought, that when we do present our requests for any advances, and it is only human, you know, for men to want to advance themselves, the first question that we are confronted with is this, "Gentlemen, don't you understand that we are competitors with the United States Steel Corporation? You have no influence, and you have no means of securing any concessions from them, and you are placing us in a very peculiar position as competitors of this big corporation when you are asking for these things."

That of itself, Senator, is the greatest menace—and I say it advisedly—the greatest menace to-day to the advancement of the wage-workers in the respective industries, that there are no means by which we can secure even the slightest cooperation in the adjustment of those matters which the industry requires, and it is a stumbling block; it prevents us from securing many things for our people in the independent plants that I am positive the independent manufacturers would be perfectly willing to give if we could insure them that the United States Steel Corporation would grant the same to their employees.

Senator WALSH. Are these independent companies on strike?

Mr. TIGHE. No.

Senator WALSH. None of them?

Mr. TIGHE. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Mr. Tighe, you have made the statement that the Steel Corporation has had to follow the lead of the union scales.

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. There appears to be a difference of opinion.

Mr. TIGHE. Certainly.

Senator PHIPPS. It has been stated to the contrary. The evidence to prove who is correct would probably be a comparison of the wages earned by the employees in the independent plants, as against those earned in the nonunion plants.

Mr. TIGHE. True.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any such figures, the figures for the nonunion plants? The average earnings of the men in the nonunion plants have been stated here.

Mr. TIGHE. In what respect? Do you mean the one man who earned \$32 per day?

Senator PHIPPS. No. One man was given that high wage, but it was stated to be an exception. The wages were classified as between skilled and unskilled labor.

Mr. TIGHE. Well, from my point of view, Senator, I could not understand how the average wage was placed at such a low figure by



the corporation, if there was such a large number of very high-priced men in their employ. The figure that he gave of one man—I do not hesitate to say that we have lots of men in our organization that make that.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, within hailing distance of that?

Mr. TIGHE. That make that rate of wages per day. I also want to state that when they spoke about the hours of rest, that the work that those men are engaged in would make it absolutely impossible for those men to be in continuous operation during those hours, because the temperature is of such a high character that they could not stand it. They have to have those rests to recuperate their vitality, to go back to it again.

Furthermore, I want to state that on a basic eight-hour day, which you Senators have heard so much about, that I was in Gary, Ind., last fall just at the time when the organizing campaign was going on. Previous to that the statement was made through the public press, supposed to come from the gentleman who preceded me, that they would not consider the eight-hour day. I am making that qualification, that it came through the public press, but the organizing campaign went on and the men in Gary become so thoroughly organized that on the very day that I was in Gary last fall only it was announced by the Steel Corporation, through the chairman of the finance committee, that they intended to make a basic eight-hour day.

Now, it has not been that these men have received time and a half all through the long years that they have been working 12 hours. The basic eight-hour day, my friends, Senators, was nothing more or less in my estimation than a desire to befuddle the men and to make it possible that when trade conditions again became normal they could remove from those men that half time that they were paying for the extra 4 hours, and make them work the full 12 hours at the normal rate of wages. That is my judgment of it. Now, I want to read a letter.

Senator PHIPPS. Pardon me a moment—

Mr. TIGHE. I want to read the letter—I want to have it put in the record—that I addressed to the Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I suggest that we get through with the past history and come down to the present time.

Mr. TIGHE. That is what I am trying to do, but the Senator is trying to place the United States Steel Corporation upon a pedestal—

Senator PHIPPS. Not the Senator.

Mr. TIGHE. No; pardon me, the honorable judge. I think that it is absolutely necessary that someone who is interested in the trade-union movement, and especially as the parent organization, to take up the defensive at least.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Mr. Tighe, you made certain statements and I asked you for the evidence that would support your position.

Mr. TIGHE. Just a moment.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not want to take up the time, but I would like to know whether or not any comparison of rates was made of those paid by the Steel Corporation and those paid by any union mills to determine whether one is higher than the other, and, if so, to what extent?

Mr. TIGHE. I would not be in a position to state, because I am not working in the mill, and you would have to get those from the pay rolls of the company, and that would be the best evidence that could not be contradicted.

Senator PHIPPS. But you know what the average wages were that were paid to the members of your union?

Mr. TIGHE. I can only judge by the tonnage rate paid, but I can not state how many tons, as I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. If you can not answer the question just say so. We are taking up too much time.

Mr. TIGHE. But I want to explain to him that this is a tonnage rate and we can not tell how many tons they turn out; but I want to say, in direct contradiction as to the organizations limiting the output, that we have no such a thing as a limit of output in the work. They can make as much as they want.

Senator PHIPPS. But when you come to make your scale for next year, certain men may ask for an increase in their tonnage rates. What evidence do they give you that they should have an increase? They must present evidence as to what their earnings have been, or you would not know whether or not the unions should get behind their demands for the increase.

Mr. TIGHE. We will get all of our evidence when we get into the conference and when we meet the manufacturers, because they will bring in their wage rate and show us conclusively whether those demands are justified or not. We pay but very little attention to that, because the conference committee has full plenary power to undo the work of the convention.

Senator PHIPPS. And do you mean to say that you do not know what the men are getting, so far as the records are concerned?

Mr. TIGHE. I want to introduce this letter. It is a very important one.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be printed in the record without reading.

Mr. TIGHE. But it is very important, and I want to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. We have spent two hours with you and you do not seem to have gotten up to the strike yet.

Mr. TIGHE. Then I will explain the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. And the reasons for the strike.

Mr. TIGHE. The reason for the strike is simply the demands for a conference on the part of the 24 international organizations. That is the reason of this strike.

The CHAIRMAN. And do I understand you to say that if this conference had been granted there would not have been a strike?

Mr. TIGHE. If this conference had been granted there would not have been a strike.

Senator STERLING. And whatever the result of the conference you say that there would have been no strike?

Mr. TIGHE. Well, Senator, the aftermath no man can say; but I want to say, in the most emphatic manner, that were it at all possible to have prevented this strike it would have been prevented.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you tell us why the strike should not have been postponed until after this conference, as requested by the President?

Mr. TIGHE. I was at the conference in Washington and voted to set the date. I knew nothing of the telegram to President Gompers until

the next day while in Pittsburgh. The two telegrams we had received at the meeting of the 24 internationals gave us no hope whatever of a conference, and there was nothing left for us to do, owing to the extreme conditions that existed; and it perhaps has not been made known, but the report coming from the men in the immediate localities of where the men were most thoroughly organized was to the effect that there were a certain number of I. W. W. organizers circularizing among the men, and boring from within, as it were, telling them, "There you are; the American Federation of Labor has given you the soft pedal again; you men will get nothing from this organization whatever. Join us. We are the only real aggressive organization that is in existence to-day." And men were beginning to listen to those appeals. The reports came in that unless something of a definite character was not done to prevent the constant discharge of men for no other reason only joining the organization, that there would be strikes, sporadic strikes, in every locality, with the result confusion, chaos, and perhaps other more serious consequences would be brought about. For the express purpose of trying, if possible, to hold and control the organization within the grasp of the American Federation of Labor or the 24 constituent organizations, the strike had to be, in the face of no positive assurance that anything would be—

Senator STERLING (interrupting). So in the last analysis, now, Mr. Tighe, the I. W. W. was the cause of the strike, according to your statements?

Mr. TIGHE. The I. W. W. was not the cause of the strike, but it was to prevent the I. W. W. from—don't take that interpretation, Senator, because it was not intended at all. The statement was made to demonstrate to you that there was dangerous elements existing—

Senator STERLING. You say that the I. W. W. were circulating among your men?

Mr. TIGHE. They were.

Senator STERLING. And were endeavoring to create suspicion among your men against the American Federation of Labor, saying that the Federation of Labor was trying to put on the soft pedal and prevent a strike, and it was because of the position taken by the I. W. W. that the strike was called.

Mr. TIGHE. No, emphatically not. It might have been a contributing cause, but the real reason, Senator, was the constant discharge of the men for joining the organization and then standing out—the breadwinners of families not being able to secure employment.

Senator STERLING. And yet you said a while ago that if Judge Gary had granted a conference there would have been no strike.

Mr. TIGHE. There is no question about that; there would have been no strike because we could have held out an encouragement and hope to the men that something of a material benefit might come from the conference.

Senator STERLING. And if a conference had been granted, and even if none of the 12 demands had been complied with, there probably would have been no strike. Do you say that?

Mr. TIGHE. Senator, I am not indulging in prophecy. I am plainly stating facts as they exist and I have knowledge of. Are you an attorney, Senator?

Senator STERLING. I profess to be.

Mr. TIGHE. Did you ever plead a case before 12 men and have a divided man among those 12 men?

Senator STERLING. Well, it happened once or twice, but not often.

Mr. TIGHE. You are very fortunate if that is the only time. How could I answer a question where countless thousands were involved, and answer with accuracy?

Now, Senator, I want to read this letter. It won't take me long to read this letter, and I want to read it because I think it is very important. It came from our national convention, and shows conclusively what efforts were made in order to effect a conciliation. It was dated "Convention Hall, Louisville, Ky., May 15, 1919," and it reads:

HON. ELBERT H. GARY.

*Chairman Executive Officers United States Steel Corporation,*

*Hoboken, N. J.*

DEAR SIR: The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of North America, in national convention assembled, have by resolution instructed the undersigned to address you as chairman of the executive officers of the United States Steel Corporation on a matter which, in the opinion of the representatives of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, is of vital importance to the corporation you have the honor to represent and to the Amalgamated Association.

As you no doubt are aware, there is a serious disturbing element in the industrial world at the present time, a great spirit of unrest has spread over our common country. It is becoming more and more acute, and there is no telling when or where the storm clouds will break. It is the judgment of the representatives of the Amalgamated Association that it is the patriotic duty of all good citizens to use their every effort to stem the tide of unrest, if possible.

The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers have admitted many thousands of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation into their organization. These members are asking that they be given consideration by the corporation you are the honorable chairman of in their respective crafts and callings, and also that, as law-abiding citizens, who desire the privilege of having their representatives meet with the chosen representatives of the corporation you represent, to jointly confer on questions that mutually concern both.

Sincerely believing that the granting of their request on your part will not only be the means of allaying that unrest, but will also promote and insure that harmony and cooperation that should at all times exist between employer and employee, to the end that all will share in the glorious triumphs so lately achieved in the war, and thereby add still more to the luster and glory of our common country.

Trusting that you will give this request on the part of the aforesaid employees of your corporation your most earnest consideration, I await your pleasure.

M. F. TIGHE, *International President.*

The answer came back on May 20:

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest your letter of May 15 instant. I agree that it is the patriotic duty of all good citizens to use their efforts in stemming the tide of unrest in the industrial world, whenever and wherever it exists.

As you know, we do not confer, negotiate with, or combat labor unions as such. We stand for the open shop, which permits a man to engage in the different lines of employment, whether he belongs to a labor union or not.

We think this attitude secures the best results to the employees generally and to the employers.

In our own way, and in accordance with our best judgment, we are rendering efficient service in the direction indicated by you.

With kind regards, I am.

Your, respectfully,

E. H. GARY, *Chairman.*

Senator STERLING. Mr. Tighe, just one question—

Mr. TIGHE (interrupting). That did not come, gentlemen, from the 24 international organizations; it came as a special request by the employees of the United States Steel Corporation from our national convention. As I said before, we had one or two squabbles there.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Tighe, I will ask you now, as a good American citizen, as I believe you to be, whether you do not think that, considering all the circumstances, the state of unrest naturally growing out of the war, the state of public opinion at the time, and the renewed activity of the I. W. W. and what you may term the Bolshevik element in the country, that it would have been the best thing to have awaited the conference on the 8th of this month, called by the President, to determine, after hearing the discussions of the conference and reading them, what the merits of this controversy were. Don't you think that would have been the better thing, rather than to have precipitated the strike at the time it was precipitated?

Mr. TIGHE. I will answer that question by saying that if there had been the slightest glimmer of hope that anything could have been done to prevent the strike it would have been done. The men who are at the head of those international organizations are not inexperienced men. Like myself, they have been through many troubles.

Mr. STERLING. You were one of the 24 committee, were you not?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator STERLING. You are one of the committee of 24?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Representing one of these international unions?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes, sir; the most important of the 24.

Senator STERLING. Now, could not that strike have been called off or prevented by the unanimous decision of the committee of 24?

Mr. TIGHE. I do not think it could have been prevented. It might have been called off, but I am as earnest and sincere as I ever was in my life when I say that I do not think it could have been prevented.

Senator STERLING. Not prevented ultimately, perhaps, that may have been as a result of the conference on the 6 of October, but might it not have been prevented until after the 6th day of October?

Mr. TIGHE. I do not think it could because we made the proposition that if it could be insured that those men were protected and those that were discharged for joining the organization, that we would be willing to consider the proposition, but that did not come, understand, until after the date had been set and the proclamation for the strike had gone out.

Senator STERLING. You are assuming, are you not, when you say the men were discharged for joining the organization?

Mr. TIGHE. If you want living evidence of it, all you have got to do is to go in the strike district, Senator. We can not give you any further evidence than that. I am not assuming anything.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Tighe, your controversy was initially with the Steel Corporation, and you state that if conference had been accorded by the representative of that company that probably a settlement might have been had. When September 22, however, was fixed as the date for the calling of the strike, the strike call was

not limited to the plants of the United States Steel Corporation, the independent plants were also involved?

Mr. TIGHE. That is correct, Senator.

Senator PHIPPS. It is shown by the record that the 12 demands were never definitely presented to the Steel Corporation. Were they definitely presented to each of the independents whose workmen were called out on strikes September 22?

Mr. TIGHE. So far as my knowledge goes, Senator, the men were instructed in every instance to present to their respective companies a request for a conference, and when they were refused then they come under the same order. Now I am qualifying that, that so far as my knowledge goes on that proposition. That is my understanding.

Senator PHIPPS. You are the president of this amalgamated association, are you not?

Mr. TIGHE. I am president of this amalgamated association, and my assistant president has been acting in my stead on account of the many duties that of course I have to go through in the regular order of our work among those mills that we have regular contracts with. We have a large number of local scales.

Senator PHIPPS. Who is your assistant president?

Mr. TIGHE. D. J. Davis; but any action that he had taken had my full consent and approval.

Senator PHIPPS. Were the dock handlers of Cleveland, Conneaut, Erie, and the other ports organized into lodges as the amalgamated?

Mr. TIGHE. No.

Senator PHIPPS. That is a different organization?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; you see there is the complexity of this situation, that in some plants where we have contractual relations those mills have been compelled to close down by reason of the fact that there were other organizations in there that the company did not have any contractual relations with, and the result has been that the men were unable to perform their daily vocations by reason of the fact that these other men were engaged in strike. The company would not recognize them or do business with them, but we are not responsible for that.

Senator PHIPPS. Now as to the dock laborers' strikes at some other points, is it your position now that no request has been made of those dock laborers, railway employees, or other crafts to come out on sympathy strike by reason of this strike now in operation in the steel industry?

Mr. TIGHE. They are practically contiguous, I suppose, or so close dovetailed that it is hard to divide them in a proposition of this character. The interests are such that it is hard to divide them. If they whip the steel workers, then they will whip all the others, just in like proportion. They show no mercy to any one particular organization.

Senator PHIPPS. Those dock laborers are organized, as you understand it?

Mr. TIGHE. That is what I understand.

Senator PHIPPS. And you understand they are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. TIGHE. I would judge they would be, because it is the American Federation of Labor that is conducting this strike, that is, the American Federation of Labor, understand, they passed the resolu-

tion, and they stand as the sponsors of the action of that committee of 24 international organizations.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know how many industries are now affected by this steel strike, collateral industries?

Mr. TIGHE. A large number of them, I am sorry to say.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any figures as to the number of men who have been called out on so-termed sympathy strikes?

Mr. TIGHE. No; I have a telegram from Pueblo, Colo., Senator, saying that the committee had waited upon the company, and I will just repeat that telegram as nearly as I can. It said this:

Six thousand men of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. have marched out to-day, thereby shattering at one fell blow the John D. Rockefeller system of organization. We are out to a man.

The telegram was something to that effect. That is the telegram I received. You know we have three or four local organizations in that plant at the present time.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course the question of the demands and the—

Mr. TIGHE. The position I want to imply, and I want to make it emphatic, is this, that the only reason these 24 international organizations entered into this campaign was on account of the failure of the individual organizations to make any headway whatever against these big corporations, and that these big corporations were a menace to the men employed in these industries, working in an independent plant. Now, that is the only point. There never would have been even the slightest attempt along those lines could the individual organization have received any recognition whatever from these corporations in the transaction of its business. It was absolutely necessary, if there was going to be any attempt at all made to advance the standard of the American wage earner to a higher plane of civilization, that an organization such as at the present time exists—and the present contest in existence is—should be put into operation.

Senator PHIPPS. As president of the amalgamated association have you any connection with the employees of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co.? For instance, if they were organized, would they belong to your association or to some other branch?

Mr. TIGHE. The larger part of them would belong to our association; that is, the rolling mills, part of them. The men in the blast furnaces would belong to the mill, mine, and smelter workers' organization.

Senator PHIPPS. As president of that association have you taken occasion to check up the situation at Pueblo to know whether or not the men have already been accorded a majority of the demands included in those 12 demands presented?

Mr. TIGHE. I am frank enough to say, Senator, that I believe there has been pretty fair treatment of the men down there. I believe that they pay as close to the amalgamated scale of prices in the rolling mills as in any other nonunion mill in the country today. I am frank enough to say that from the reports I have heard from there that they have been paying the amalgamated scale or as close to the amalgamated scale in Pueblo as in any nonunion plant in the country.

Senator PHIPPS. Then does not the thing resolve itself down to this, that the workmen at the plant of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. went out simply for recognition of the union?

Mr. TIGHE. Simply for the purpose of trying to be in a position to add their might to securing, collectively any of those things that the human heart desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you not about through, Mr. Tighe?

Mr. TIGHE. Unless you have some questions to ask me I am perfectly satisfied to retire.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is anything more you want to say, you may say it, but it seems to me that you have covered the ground pretty thoroughly.

Mr. TIGHE. All I want to say in my closing remarks is this:

I was very much put out yesterday at the flat refusal of the honorable judge to answer the request of the Senator, or the flat statement that he would not, under any circumstances, submit to arbitration.

Arbitration has been recognized all over the world as one of the means of compromise, where there are interests opposing each other. Arbitration has been recognized in this country as one of the great civilizing influences by which the general public can get an estimate of the merits or demerits of any controversy that directly affects the public interest. I was very much distressed to hear him express himself in the manner he did, because in all the long years of my connection with the trade-union movement—and I am not a child by any means—I have taken this position: That either a corporation or a labor organization, speaking from the standpoint of American citizenship, where the great public interest is directly, most materially and vitally affected, that will positively refuse to submit to a fair-minded arbitration by American citizens, men selected by the highest authority in the land—that he or they are sowing the seeds and enlivening the germ of anarchy; that it is an absolute impossibility to stifle the growth of that insidious doctrine where there is no other recourse left but the annihilation of one or the two opposing parties.

Senator STERLING. Where the issue is the closed shop or the open shop what is there to arbitrate?

Mr. TIGHE. There is no issue of that kind in the present controversy. That is an assumption.

Senator STERLING. Kindly wait until I have completed my question. He assumes, anyhow, that that is the real issue involved here; that is, whether or not he shall be subject to the domination of organized labor so as to require him, in effect, to employ none but union men.

Mr. TIGHE. Would not fair-minded arbitrators decide that question as to whether his assumption was a proper one or not, just the same as they would decide the question of whether our position was correct or not. And, Senator, the evidence that I have tried to produce for you has been to show that for long years we have been doing business with these companies we have never asked, from even those that we are doing business with now, for a closed shop; and that should demonstrate to any fair-minded man that that can not be the issue. They never had the closed shop when they were doing business with us. We never asked them to have a closed shop. We do not ask the Western Bar Iron Association or the Western Sheet & Tin Plate Manufacturers' Association for the closed shop.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you define the closed shop and the open shop? We have had a number of depositions here.



Mr. TIGHE. The closed shop, in my judgment, is a shop that is closed to union men; where a man known to carry a union card is discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. Is an open shop one in which a union man can work without question and in which a nonunion man can work without question?

Mr. TIGHE. The open shop—we have never been able to give a broad interpretation because that is the appellation that has been handed down to us. We do not know the real interpretation of the open shop up to the present time. We know what a union shop is.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not an open shop a shop where a man can work whether he belongs to a union or not, where he is not stopped from working because he belongs to a union, and where he is not stopped from working because he does not belong to a union?

Mr. TIGHE. It might be termed where a man would be able to form a mutual admiration society or an old ladies' gossiping club, or something of that kind; but so far as being of any benefit it would bring no results.

Senator STERLING. Do you not understand that to be the interpretation of the heads of these industries themselves—namely, that an open shop is a shop where either union or nonunion men can work?

Mr. TIGHE. I can only understand what my experience of over 40 years in the trades-union movement has shown, and that is in all those years we have never had the closed shop.

Senator STERLING. I ask you if you do not know that to be the interpretation of the closed shop, the interpretation of men in these industries—namely, that it is a place where union men and nonunion men stand on the same footing and either may work?

Mr. TIGHE. Why, that is only—to use a word that has become prominent since the war—a kind of camouflage, that is about it.

Senator STERLING. I will ask you if that is not the general and public interpretation of the term "open shop"—that it is a shop whether union or nonunion men may work freely?

Mr. TIGHE. I could not say that it is, from a trade-union standpoint. I could not say that it is—

Senator STERLING. I am not talking about it from a trade-union standpoint—

Mr. TIGHE (continuing). Because our experience has shown that what they call the open shop has been the closed shop to the union man.

Senator STERLING. I am asking you right now as to what you believe to be the general interpretation of the open shop and as to whether it does not mean a place where either union or nonunion men can work?

Mr. TIGHE. We have tried to instruct the public that that was not our interpretation of it.

Senator STERLING. Then you must have had something to instruct?

Mr. TIGHE. We have been trying to instruct them along those lines. We can recognize a union authority, but we do not know, we can not give the proper interpretation of the other, because we allow non-union men to work in our mills.

Senator STERLING. Is that an unreasonable interpretation. Is there anything strange or unreasonable about the interpretation I have referred to?

Mr. TIGHE. As I told you, I do not deal in suppositions. I am not a politician acute enough to answer those question in a round about way; but this much I want to say now, along the lines I have already said, that the paternal features in the industry that have been so very fluently expounded by the corporate interests, are nothing more or less, in the judgment of our minds, than a hog-chain shackling the employees, putting them in the position that they dare not, at any time, assert those inalienable rights the American citizen is supposed to have—because once he becomes the owner of that property he must be employed in that plant, he must be submissive to any conditions that management may undertake to put upon him, or if he loses his position, what value is placed upon the property? Now, those are conditions that we say exist.

And the so-called bonus system—we are opposed to that. We believe a man should be paid for the actual labor he does and that pay should be put in his envelope on every pay day and should not be left to the discretion of a so-called philanthropic employer at the end of a certain period. Now, that is the position I occupy.

Senator STERLING. Do you regard that as a species of oppression?

Mr. TIGHE. We do not regard it as a species of Americanism as we would like to understand it, where every man is free from everything except the enforcement of the law, and we stand for that first, last, and all the time. The law is supreme.

Senator STERLING. Is the bonus system anything more than a recognition of the merit of an individual, and the product he turns out?

Mr. TIGHE. It is left to the discretion of some one, that bonus system. If a man is worthy of it he should get it every pay day, not as a compensation afterwards. He should receive it in his pay envelope for every day's good service.

Senator STERLING. Are the men who are getting bonuses making much complaint?

Mr. TIGHE. Of course it is one of the universal conditions of the world that men, as a general proposition, will accept those things, when they have no other alternative to get redress.

The CHAIRMAN. Your position is that they do not ask for gifts?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; that is our position exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. You ask for justice and not gifts?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you regard bonuses as gifts?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; that is it exactly.

Senator WALSH. Do I correctly understand the laboring man's definition of union shop to be a shop where there are employed union men and nonunion men, but a shop where the employer deals with the representatives of the unions?

Mr. TIGHE. That is a general definition of it. The only place where what might be termed an entire union shop is found is where it has been mutually agreed upon for the benefit of the employer.

Senator WALSH. Do I correctly understand that laboring men call a closed shop a shop which does not permit any union men to be employed?

Mr. TIGHE. That is the interpretation we generally give it.

Senator WALSH. Do I correctly understand that the term open shop is one that you do not recognize as a laboring man, but one that the employer calls a shop open to everybody?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator WALSH. But you say that it has turned out to be a shop open to everybody but a union man?

Mr. TIGHE. Correct, and if a union man does happen to get in there he is of no benefit—

Senator WALSH. I ask you this question with emphasis upon the fact that your answer is important. Did you or any representative of the American Federation of Labor have it in your heart, or was it your purpose in any way, to ask the United States Steel Corporation to establish anything other than a union shop which permitted union men and nonunion men to be employed?

Mr. TIGHE. I could not answer that other than so far as my knowledge goes there was not at any time a single utterance that conveyed any other idea than a desire to negotiate, to be able to present conditions to the employer. There was no question at any time ever raised that it was the intent or purpose to demand of the corporation or others what they classify as the closed shop.

Senator STERLING. In the independent steel plants where you have unions, are there or are there not nonunion men employed?

Mr. TIGHE. Most undoubtedly there are, and in many instances a great number of them.

Senator STERLING. Is there any contract which you have made with any steel companies which limits and restricts the employment of men to union men solely and alone?

Mr. TIGHE. No. We have in our organization trade autonomy. We do as we please. We have no such provision as you speak of. In the Western Bar Iron Association, we have what they call an agreement which gives the employer, in case we do not come to an agreement by the 30th of June, it gives them the privilege of working for 30 days longer, and during that intermission we get together again. In consideration of that privilege that we give them, they have themselves given us a written statement to this effect: That in consideration of the privilege given them we say that the men working in our mills should be governed by the Amalgamated Association rules and regulations—not “shall be,” but “should be.”

Senator STERLING. Just one other question. I was interested in what you said about arbitration. Do you believe that political disputes between countries which lead to war should be arbitrated before war takes place?

Mr. TIGHE. Most undoubtedly I do. I am a peace-loving citizen.

Senator STERLING. And you also believe that disputes between employers and employees, that may lead to industrial war and distress, should be arbitrated?

Mr. TIGHE. Most unquestionably. I do not think there is any question of any direct importance that affects the general public that should not be arbitrated.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Tighe, referring again to this requested conference, suppose you had sat down around the table, as you have done with independents at Atlantic City and elsewhere, and after exchanging views it developed that the attitude of the Steel Corporation was a refusal to recognize the union by making contracts with them?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. As a union, I mean; would that still have meant a strike, or would you have been content with the conference you had held?

Mr. TIGHE. That is tantamount to the question that the other Senator asked, and I answered that it was absolutely impossible for me to answer a suppositious case. I say that had that conference been held, or even the signification of the fact that if the honorable judge had said "Well, gentlemen, I will meet you on a certain date," say after the 6th of October, or anything of that sort—now. I am almost positive—and I am simply speaking for myself—that the conference would have said something to the men who are clamoring for this strike, and it would have been delayed. But they had nothing to offer to the men as a solution. I am positive of that for the simple reason that the first telegram was received from President Wilson—and I am not going to say what it was—but it gave no encouragement, and yet, rather than precipitate—although there had been a vote taken previous that in case a conference was not secured with Judge Gary that this committee should meet and set the date for a strike—yet we hesitated even then, and a telegram was composed and sent to President Wilson to find out if there was anything of a hopeful nature that would prevent us from calling the strike. I want to say to you, Senators, that if there is one thing on the face of God's green earth that fills me with apprehension and horror it is a strike. I will do anything honorable to prevent it.

Senator McKELLAR. You said you favored arbitration very much. Are you in favor of an arbitration that the Government might arrange?

Mr. TIGHE. Most undoubtedly. I am in favor of the Government above everything, because I am a loyal adherent to the Government.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think Congress should pass a law providing for the arbitration of disputes between capital and labor?

Mr. TIGHE. Of a compulsory character?

Senator McKELLAR. Of course it could not be any other way.

Mr. TIGHE. That is, its findings must be compulsory?

Senator McKELLAR. After properly investigating each case and with proper representation on both sides, representation of both capital and labor, would you be in favor of that kind of an arbitration?

Mr. TIGHE. If it in any sense affected the liberties of American citizenship, I question very much whether I would favor it.

Senator McKELLAR. Then what do you mean when you say that you are in favor of arbitration and that this is a matter that should be arbitrated? I think there is a great deal of force in what you say about it, but it occurs to me that if arbitration is a good thing in a case like this, that it would be a fair thing to have permanently, so that disputes between capital and labor might be arbitrated for the benefit of both sides and for the benefit of our common country. I just wanted to get your views on it. Would you be in favor of a measure of that sort or not?

Mr. TIGHE. I would have to give that matter more thought, because I am one of those who at all times desires to consider whether it would in any manner or form take away any of the liberties that up to the present time have made our country the greatest and grandest under the sun.

Senator McKELLAR. I surely would not be willing for any law to take away the liberties of any American citizen; but suppose a law could be framed that would not do that, but under which disputes of this kind might be adjusted; what do you say about that kind of a law? I have not made up my mind about the matter at all, and it has been proposed and I would like to have your views on it.

Mr. TIGHE. I have not given that matter the careful study and thought that so ponderous a question as that should receive. That is a mighty, mighty problem, in a country such as ours.

Senator WALSH. From the disputes that I heard while governor of my State, on the question of a compulsory arbitration law, or an arbitration law which provided for publicity without compulsion, I understood the position of the American workingman to be that taking away from him the power to strike lessens his influence and puts him at a disadvantage in presenting his case before any board of arbitration. Is that your position?

Mr. TIGHE. That is the general thought, I believe, that permeates—

Senator WALSH (interposing). That if there were a law preventing strikes the workman is placed at a decided disadvantage as compared to the capitalist, his only weapon being taken away?

Mr. TIGHE. You are correct, and there are so many avenues in matters of this character where labor in the past has not been treated with the same respect and consideration that those who are more highly enlightened in the world's goods have received, that it is actually a dominating fear that there would be elements creep in there that would influence, just as has been said, the minds of men along lines that would not be beneficial to the laboring man. In other words, a workingman has a limited education, and the environments that have surrounded him from early childhood naturally place him at a great disadvantage in presenting cases, even if he has counsel. The counsel has not rubbed elbows with the man in his daily vocation, and I say to you gentlemen in all sincerity and with perfect frankness, and with due respect, that unless a man has been employed in the different and various occupations that it is a mighty hard thing for him to even conjecture the many difficulties that arise in those industrial plants to which the workingman is subject, and the only avenue he has, the only preservation of his health and everything that goes with it, is the agency of the trades-union movement.

Senator STERLING. Take a law short of a compulsory arbitration law, what we might term an investigation law, which would prevent either a strike or a lock-out while the issue or controversy was being considered by a board of conciliation or mediation—would you object to a law of that kind?

Mr. TIGHE. That would be more along the lines that would at least give the men a chance of determining—I have always been a believer in public expression; I believe that the public should have full knowledge of all transactions in which they are directly affected, and I am a firm believer in that principle, and if that would be beneficial, if it would bring about justice, of course I would be for it. We of course may make mistakes. I am not claiming that labor unions are infallible, of course. We make mistakes, and we pay for them every time we make them.

Senator STERLING. There you would be willing to leave it to the determination of the public, or public opinion, after such a board as I have described had given the public its findings in regard to the controversy?

Mr. TIGHE. It might be the means of securing our opinions along lines that we have at the present time no conception of after we had gone into every detail of it, just the same as we have in our annual conference. We go in there with firm convictions and let the manufacturers present their side of the case to us, and when we meet in private conference we say, "Hell, if we knew that we never would have presented that", that is what we say, and the first thing we do we withdraw them there things and we come back and say, "We withdraw that proposition." That is the proper way for to settle those things.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Tighe, you have expressed yourself as thinking—

Mr. TIGHE (consulting with Mr. Gompers). Why, what I want to say in answer to that question, of course is stated now, the thought was given to me because I am not altogether clear, you know, you are confusing me somewhat, Senators, by this close application of questions, you know. The Canada law, as I understand, and the Colorado law, which is almost in the line of the Senators', has been proven unsuccessful by reason of the fact that the men have been compelled to work under certain systems of injustice while these investigations were going on and the prolongation of those investigations is simply adding to it, you see.

Senator PHIPPS. Let us get back to a correct understanding of your view regarding this matter of arbitrating this question as has been proposed. You are on record as favoring that method of disposing of it.

Mr. TIGHE. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. On the general proposition as to whether you would subscribe to arbitration you make a reservation—

Mr. TIGHE. This is the age of reservations, Senator, if I know anything about it.

Senator PHIPPS. It rather looks that way, perhaps, but does it not occur to you that in this particular case the very point you raise is the reason given by the other side for its refusal to arbitrate, that arbitration might result in denying citizens their proper inherent rights in that they would be bound by the result of the arbitration.

Mr. TIGHE. We would be perfectly willing, at least I would be willing, to have President Wilson appoint an arbitration committee to make this arbitration.

Senator PHIPPS. You are on record as to that, but the objections of the other side have been stated.

Mr. TIGHE. I am perfectly satisfied to that.

Senator WALSH. Just one more question, suggested by Senator Sterling's question. Do I understand that one of the objections that workingmen make to the plan proposed by Senator Sterling, and I am only stating as I understand the objection is this, that an employer, not acting in good faith, could hold his men there during the trial by arbitration, stock up his plant and be in a position when the men finally did strike to prolong it by having a large stock, that his

own men had accumulated for him during the period of the mediation?

Mr. TIGHE. That is one of the fears that naturally would be in the bosom of the workingmen, and it would be absolutely for to prevent a question of that kind. Now, our organization has a rule governing along this line, that in the negotiations with employers whatever wages they receive in advance of their last year's scale at the end of those negotiations starts from the beginning of the year. If there is a reduction it starts from the time reduction is accepted. We have that, of course, in our individual organization, a principal of that kind. That prevents the men from working for a reduction during the interim, because if they secure any consideration as a result of negotiations they get it from the expiration of the scale year.

Senator WALSH. I have been asked to ask you a question.

Mr. TIGHE. Certainly.

Senator WALSH. I think it might go in the record. It is as follows: Would you favor the passage by Congress of an arbitration law, not compulsory, providing the conciliatory machinery as a disinterested court of equity, the party to the controversy who would then submit to arbitration would be supported by public opinion, and the other party would lose public opinion?

Mr. TIGHE. That is a sort of hypothetical question, is it?

Senator WALSH. I am afraid it is. In substance it provides for legislation setting up the machinery for arbitration without either side being bound, to leave the issue to public opinion to decide. That machinery exists in many States, does it not, through the law?

Mr. TIGHE. Before I would answer that positively I would have to inquire into results of a law that has been inexistence to determine whether it was worked out to the satisfaction of the people concerned or not.

The CHAIRMAN. I think, Mr. Tighe, we are through with you, but I ask you to give the committee the names and addresses of seven to ten men who are working in these different mills, who can give us evidence as to conditions. Will you do that?

Mr. TIGHE. I think so.

Mr. Chairman. I should like to have this advertisement published in the Pittsburgh Gazette-Times, Tuesday, September 30, 1919, in the record, too.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. TIGHE. It is a full-page advertisement that you had yesterday, headed "America is Calling You."

Senator WALSH. Who published that?

Mr. TIGHE. It was published in every Pittsburgh newspaper, printed in four or five languages.

Senator WALSH. You want us to find out by whom?

Mr. TIGHE. Yes; when you get to Pittsburgh find that out if you can, but you know they have so many avenues by which this can be concealed; in other wards, they have got it in what is called the Labor World, which is the most notorious rat paper in the country; has not a single union member in it.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Tighe.

Mr. TIGHE. I thank you, Senators. I certainly appreciate the courtesy that you have shown me.

(The paper referred to is here printed in full as follows:)

**AMERICA IS CALLING YOU.**

This is no ordinary strike. Rather must it be looked upon as the diabolical attempt of a small group of radicals to disorganize labor and plant revolution in this country. Do you doubt it? Read these few excerpts from the published syndicalistic writings of one of the strike leaders: "The Syndicalist sees in the State only an instrument of oppression, a bungling administrator of industry and proposes to exclude it from the future society." "The Syndicalist movement is radically opposed to democracy and the State." "Radically opposed to democracy and the State." Is that clear enough? You may as well face the situation squarely. This is no ordinary strike. America is challenged and by the same token America is calling you. Passive indifference will no longer do. The time has come for definite aggressive action. This viper of radicalism that would destroy American liberty and throw the country into chaos that has caused untold suffering, starvation and death in Russia, must be put down. The people of this country do not want revolution. They do not want the Russian Soviet. They want only American life and liberty under American government. You know how Germany crippled the industries of France, Belgium, Serbia, Russia and other European countries during the war. Do not let any act of yours help Germany to win the industrial battle from America now that the war is over. Keep America busy, and prosperous, and American. Go back to work.

(Whereupon, at 1.05 o'clock p. m., recess was taken until 2.30 p. m. the same day.)

**AFTER RECESS.**

The committee met at 2.30 p. m., pursuant to recess.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, ORGANIZER, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY CARMEN.**

The CHAIRMAN. We will go ahead with Mr. Foster now.

Mr. Foster, will you state to the reporter, please, your name and residence and business?

Mr. FOSTER. William Z. Foster, 1412 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh; International organizer, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you held that position, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. About three years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that one of the organizations in this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. Engaged in this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some 24 different organizations?

Mr. FOSTER. There are.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the work of an organizer?

Mr. FOSTER. The work of an organizer is to assemble the men in such fashion that they may be able to present their grievances collectively.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, to procure members for the union?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I wish you would go ahead in your own way and tell us the causes of this strike from your standpoint and your relationship to the strike. What are the reasons for this strike? Why is this strike now?



Mr. FOSTER. This movement of the steel workers at this time relates to movements that have gone on in the past among them. It was the policy of the organizations and of the men themselves, who dictate the policy of these organizations, to restrict the organizations to a great extent to the more skilled men in the industry. If they did not deliberately restrict it, at least they did not make an effort to get the unskilled so much. But that policy proved to be ineffective. The steel companies were strong enough to defeat the skilled men, and it became necessary, in order for the unskilled men to protect themselves at all, that the organization be extended to them.

That led up to the present campaign. The men in all these mills—not all, possibly, but in most of the mills—for years have tried to organize and in many ways have demanded the assistance of the organizations to help them from existing conditions; and as the result of that general demand, the movement sprang up, bearing in mind the experiences of past years and the interests of the international unions in the industry, so that there might be a concerted effort made all along the line and in all branches of the industry and in all trades in the industry to secure better conditions for the men. That took shape—a resolution was introduced in the Chicago Federation of Labor about a year and a half ago requesting the American Federation of Labor to undertake a campaign of that character.

The CHAIRMAN. What relation was that convention to the St. Paul convention?

Mr. FOSTER. It was the St. Paul convention. This resolution was adopted by the American Federation of Labor at St. Paul, and provision was made to call a meeting of the 24 international presidents to start this campaign. That meeting was held the 1st of August, last year, in Chicago, and this campaign was started.

Now, you ask that I state my connection with that campaign. I want to say that I am the secretary of the committee that came out of that first meeting of the presidents on August 1, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is that committee managing this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. That committee is managing this strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You are secretary, then, of the committee that is managing the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. I am. That committee consists of the presidents of all of these international unions, numbering over 2,000,000 men, and in the event, or in case, any of the international presidents are not able to attend then they delegate somebody to act in their stead.

Now, in the work of this committee it has fallen upon me to take care of the office and attend to that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. You have active charge of the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Who has?

Mr. FOSTER. The committee superintends this strike.

The CHAIRMAN. That committee superintends the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the committee themselves are not there, they have a representative—

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). In Pittsburgh at the present time we have several members of that committee, and they act in the absence of the whole committee. I have absolutely no authority of any kind whatsoever to adopt any policies in regard to the strike. Any matter

that comes up must be referred to that committee that is in Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. What are your duties?

Mr. FOSTER. My duties are to act as secretary of the strike and look after the organizing work. I handle the finances, of course, in connection with the office work.

If I may be permitted, I would like to state that there has been a great deal of misstatement appearing in the press about my connection and powers and so forth in this strike. I want to say that this strike is conducted by these international unions, and I have no authority whatsoever in the matter. Everything, however small, except possibly detailing organizers here and there, must be referred to that committee, and that committee consists of men representing more than 2,000,000 men, including such men as the president of the United Mine Workers, President Tighe, President Valentine, President Johnson, of the Machinists, and all the rest of them. Every move that has been made, every policy that has been adopted, has been with the full knowledge and consent of that whole committee.

At times we find ourselves—we call meetings on a certain day and we find important questions pop up in the course of that meeting, and it might be that, instead of 24 members, we will only have 10 or a dozen represented, and all of that 10 or 12 international unions would proceed to take action, but we always call a special meeting of our whole committee, so that every organization would thoroughly understand what was going on and be in a position to assume responsibility. The reason for that is this, that this is a federated proposition, and it is a free-will organization.

It is not bound together by any constitution or law or anything, except just common interest. The only way we can maintain that committee together is to have a thorough understanding and agreement among the organizations taking part in it, and in order to preserve that agreement we find it necessary to continually refer back to these international heads.

For example, when the question of a strike vote was proposed, there were several trades absent from our meeting. We had a great majority of the trades present, and they were unanimously in favor of putting out a strike vote; but we took this position: That the only way this committee could function was to have unanimous action, and therefore it was necessary to call a special meeting to consider the proposition of a strike. That special meeting was called, all the organizations were notified, and they went on record for a strike at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. FOSTER. The second meeting was July 20, the meeting at which they voted for a strike—voted to put out a strike vote, in fact.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to go back to the St. Paul convention. That resolution was adopted—

Mr. FOSTER. It was adopted there by the American Federation of Labor. That came from the Chicago Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. It came from the Chicago Federation of Labor? Who introduced the resolution to do that?

Mr. FOSTER. The Chicago Federation of Labor introduced it.

The CHAIRMAN. They introduced it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, they introduced it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you come down to this meeting in July at which it was voted to put out a strike vote. Was the vote then taken?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote was ordered taken and ordered returned in a month.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us just how that would be done.

Mr. FOSTER. How the vote was taken?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. This committee itself has no power to take a vote. This committee has no power to order a strike. All this committee serves to do is to bring the responsible men together so that they can express themselves.

Senator STERLING. By "this committee" you mean the 24 heads of the 24 international unions?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; what we call the national committee for organizing iron and steel workers.

The CHAIRMAN. And they really submit the question of a strike to the men?

Mr. FOSTER. To the international unions, and they do as they please with it, according to their desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Now trace that along, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. The way we took the vote was this. The committee went on record in favor of it. We know that each man on that committee is speaking with the full authority of his organization, and if he agrees to have that strike vote taken for his organization, that settles it so far as his organization is concerned. We let them take the vote in accordance with their own laws. We do not superintend it in any way, shape or form. All we got from that vote was the report from the trades, the organized trades, as to the percentage of men in their organizations that voted for this strike, with this exception: that in some places the men had not yet been placed in the proper organizations to which they belonged under our scheme of things in the American Federation of Labor, and it was necessary for the committee itself to take the vote of those men. We also took the vote of unorganized men as far as we were able to do so in the unorganized districts; but the men in these international unions, the committees, take the vote according to their own laws, and we have no control over them. All we can do is to take their reports, which we did at the Youngstown meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. What were those reports?

Mr. FOSTER. Those reports showed the vote, as we calculated it, to be 98 per cent. I want to be frank about it and say it was a conservative estimate.

Senator WALSH. Ninety-eight per cent of what?

Mr. FOSTER. Of the total number of men voting.

Senator WALSH. What was that number, do you know?

Mr. FOSTER. We have no way of telling that. We can only tell the votes we took ourselves, because each international union takes its own vote. Of course the national committee is able to tabulate all the votes it took itself.

Senator STERLING. Now, the members of this committee, who represented the several international unions, the 24 men, had previously declared for a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. I thought I understood you to say a while ago that before you submitted it these 24 men had declared in favor of a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. No; they declared in favor of putting out a strike vote. After a vote is taken a conference may be had, which would do away with the necessity for a strike.

Senator STERLING. In declaring in favor of putting out a strike vote, did the committee express the opinions of the committee at all in regard to it?

Mr. FOSTER. They never do. They just submit the proposition: "Are you willing to support the committee to the extent of ceasing work in the event the demands of the men are not met?" a proposition along that line, and the men vote yes or no. That is the usual way of taking a strike vote.

Senator STERLING. Are there any cases where any propaganda is put out by the members of the committee when they call a strike vote?

Mr. FOSTER. You mean in this campaign?

Senator STERLING. No; in any cases.

Mr. FOSTER. I can not say about any case, but in this campaign I would say more emphatically, no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did that question of submitting it to a vote come up? What discussion had there been about a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. The discussion had been this: A general conference was held in Pittsburgh, on May 25, of representatives of this council formed from unions all over the United States, and that conference was called to ascertain the opinions of the steel workers, and in response to a large number of demands from the men to have something done to better their condition. That conference was held and at it a large number of resolutions were submitted requesting the national committee to seek a conference with the steel companies for the purpose—then they would recite the things they figured they ought to have.

The CHAIRMAN. How were the men represented in that conference?

Mr. FOSTER. The local unions sent two or three delegates.

The CHAIRMAN. Did those delegates complain of conditions?

Mr. FOSTER. Indeed they did

The CHAIRMAN. What were their complaints, in a general way?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that possibly the greatest complaint that was made was the complaint of a lack of industrial democracy in the steel industry. There is a strong feeling on the part of the men that they should be given consideration.

If I may be permitted to state it as I get it, it amounts to simply this: In the make up of an industry there are two great factors, without which it can not operate. One is the capital or the property itself and the other is the men, those who work at the mills. Now the way things operate in the steel industry at the present time is that property has all rights and the men have none—property rights are 100 per cent in the steel industry and human rights are no per cent.

Senator BORAH. Mr. Foster, you say that property rights are 100 per cent and human rights are no per cent. Will you give us an illustration of what you mean by that?

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking from this standpoint: When it comes to regulation of the conditions under which the men shall work, the hours of labor, the working conditions and wages, the men have absolutely nothing to say about it. That is a matter that is ruled upon by these men who represent the property interest in the industry.

Senator WALSH. You mean that their power of influence is zero?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the idea.

Senator WALSH. Not that their conditions are zero?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; I do not say that; but their representation in the establishment of conditions is absolutely nil. These men have objected to that. They believe that in those matters fundamentally affecting them that they are entitled to a voice. They realize that capital is a great factor in the industry, but they also believe that labor is a great factor in the industry, and that it is impossible to operate the plants without labor. They say that the employer makes a heavy investment in the industry, but that so do they. They put their whole life in there. Their whole life and the life of their family is put in there, and that they are entitled to representation, and if I might say, that that representation is what is known as the right of collective bargaining, and I think that is the fundamental proposition at stake in this controversy. It has been placed No. 1 in the list of demands, and I think it belongs there.

I might say further that the steel workers are making a great effort to secure that fundamental right of collective bargaining. If they do not succeed in securing it at this time, the fight must go on. They have rigged up a great combination in themselves, a big organization, but if that is not big enough and not strong enough, they will organize a bigger one and a stronger one, and fight will go on until they acquire that right of collective bargaining in the steel industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that discussed at the meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the wages themselves discussed, or merely the fact that they had never had anything to do with the fixing of wages? Was the complaint about wages made?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; there were many scales submitted. Every local union submitted its idea of what it thought the wages ought to be, all making demands for this, that, or the other, and those things were all referred to a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The strike really was not because of low wages, was it?

Mr. FOSTER. Partially so; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there complaint of hours of service?

Mr. FOSTER. A very strong complaint on that score. I might say further, if I might, in connection with that first proposition, that these men feel this way about it. They see the United States Government dealing with its employees, and they know this much, that the United States Government is sovereign in this country. There is absolutely no power that it yields to, except, of course, the suffrage of the people. If there is anything sovereign in the country that represents the sovereignty of the country, it is the United States Government; and yet the United States Government does not balk at

dealing with its employees and haggling with them over clauses and agreements, and quibbling and working the thing out on a bona fide system of collective bargaining, and the feeling is general among these men that if the United States Government will do that, if the Government itself will recognize the right of collective bargaining, Judge Gary and the steel magnates, who have a much weaker title to their properties than the Government has to its, they have no right to withhold that.

Senator STERLING. Would you have the Government adopt the system of collective bargaining with its employees?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is using that system.

Senator STERLING. It is using that system?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. With its employees now?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. What classes of employees?

Mr. FOSTER. The railroad employees.

Senator STERLING. It is collectively bargaining with them?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Is it using that system anywhere else?

Mr. FOSTER. It is using it in the shipyards.

Senator BORAH. As I understand, Mr. Foster, the primary achievement, in order to democratize the industry, is to have collective bargaining, in your mind?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator BORAH. You place that first?

Mr. FOSTER. First.

Senator BORAH. Then you would say, from your standpoint, that the primary basis of this strike is the right to establish or the desire to establish the principle of collective bargaining?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, the men—that is only part of it, but that is the big part, in my estimation.

Senator BORAH. And I ask you if you think that is the primary principle?

Mr. FOSTER. I honestly believe that if the right of collective bargaining had been recognized that this strike would not have occurred.

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Foster, are you in favor of organized Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I see the Senator is reading from the red book.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes, sir; and I want to read you from it. Will you look at this book and say whether that book —

Mr. TIGHE (interposing). It is not necessary.

Senator McKELLAR (continuing). Was written by you, in whole or in part? Just look at it, please.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I would have to read it through before I could say.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, it is a book on Syndicalism, by Francis C. Ford and William Z. Foster. Are you that William Z. Foster that is referred to on the title page of the book?

Mr. FOSTER. I guess I am.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, you say you would have to read it through. I am going to read you a paragraph from it and ask you

if you wrote the paragraph, or subscribed to the paragraph. It is entitled, on page 3, "The revolution":

The wages system is the most brazen and gigantic robbery ever perpetrated since the world began. So disastrous are its consequences on the vast armies of slaves within its toils that it is threatening the very existence of society. If society is even to be perpetuated—to say nothing of being organized upon an equitable basis—the wages system must be abolished. The thieves at present in control of the industries must be stripped of their booty and society so reorganized that every individual shall have free access to the social means of production. This social reorganization will be a revolution. Only after such a revolution will the great inequalities of modern society disappear.

And under the title of "The Means to the Revolution":

The class struggle. For years progressive workers have realized the necessity for this revolution. They have also realized that it must be brought about by the workers themselves.

Is that your composition?

Mr. FOSTER. That sounds like it.

Senator McKELLAR. You know whether it is, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have not read it for a good many years.

Senator McKELLAR. Will you look at the part I have read and state whether or not it is your composition?

Mr. FOSTER. The chairman asked me a question. If I might be permitted to continue that and then——

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to that, Senator?

Senator McKELLAR. I think he might answer this question first, because it is directly in line with something he has already said, and I would like to know whether it is your composition or not, and whether that is your belief or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that that is probably my composition. I won't dispute it.

Senator McKELLAR. Is it your belief, the doctrine of revolution, as there enunciated? Is that your honest belief now?

Mr. FOSTER. The chairman has requested me to tell what this strike is about; and if I may be permitted to do that, then I will answer all of these questions later.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have a right to have an answer to my question now.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you insist upon it?

Senator McKELLAR. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, if the Senator insists upon it, of course, I take it that Senators will go into this matter very fully.

Senator McKELLAR. Let us have an answer to that question and then go ahead.

Senator WALSH. I imagine that the witness wants to go into that matter at some length.

Senator McKELLAR. I will be very glad for him to do so.

Senator WALSH. I imagine that he does not object to a discussion of the question. Am I right?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to take it up in some sort of order, if I could.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no doubt that the witness will be questioned very fully about that book.

Senator McKELLAR. Of course. I am still waiting for an answer, Mr. Foster.

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question.

(The reporter read as follows:)

Is it your belief, the doctrine of revolution as there enunciated? Is that your honest belief now?

Mr. FOSTER. I should answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will say this. I will say not only with regard to that, but to everything that is in there, that it was written some eight or nine years ago; I do not know exactly when, and at that time—well, I might state this, that I am one who was raised in the slums. I am one who has had a hard experience in life. I have probably seen some of the worst sides of it, and I have knocked around in the industries, and I have seen many things that I did not agree with in the industries, and at the time that that was written, I want to say that I was a follower and an advocate of the Spanish, French, and Italian system of unionism, and since then I have become possibly a little less impatient, a little less extreme, possibly, in my views, considerably so, in fact; and to-day I will state that I am an advocate of the system of unionism as we find it in America and England. Now, I will say that not only for that statement, but for everything that is in that book.

Senator McKELLAR. You have not answered my question, which is: Do you honestly and sincerely believe in the statement that is made on page 3 of this book on the subject of "revolution," which I have read to you?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that if I were writing that again, or if I were writing a book, I would not include any of that that is in that book.

Senator McKELLAR. But my question is, which I will repeat: Do you honestly and sincerely believe in the doctrine of revolution as stated on page 3 of this book, as read to you?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe I have answered you as well as I could. I stated that I would not write it.

Senator McKELLAR. It is a question now that is perfectly susceptible of being answered "yes" or "no," and then you can make any explanation that you like, because I want to be entirely fair with you. I would not be unfair for anything in the world. It is just a question of do you still believe in it?

Mr. FOSTER. I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman. In this campaign there has been a great deal of newspaper publicity, and the newspapers have treated the men in charge of the campaign most unfairly, most unfairly, and I say that advisedly. President Gompers, who gained such a splendid reputation during the war, has been lambasted all over the country for the part that he has played in this work. The papers have made, as a rule—

Senator McKELLAR (after a pause). I am listening, sir.

Senator BORAH. Mr. Foster, will you permit me to make a suggestion?

Senator McKELLAR. I would like very much for him to answer that question.

Senator BORAH. This is in connection with it, but I will not break into it.

Senator McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will wait just a moment until he answers the question.



(The witness made no response.)

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I still want to know whether the witness is willing to answer the question yes or no, whether he now believes in the doctrine of revolution as stated on page 3 of this pamphlet which was read to him.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to state again, Mr. Chairman, that in this campaign the organizers and the officers of the American Federation of Labor have been entirely misrepresented. They have tried to becloud the issue and to defeat the hopes and aspirations of 400,000 striking steelworkers by making me the issue, and John Fitzpatrick; and I want to protect those men. I am not here to lie, I am not here to cavil, I am not here to apologize for myself; I am here to tell the truth as far as I can. But if I seem to hesitate about answering specific questions about what is in that book, it is with this distinct understanding—that I do not feel my answers will be properly handled by the press of this country. If the Senate Committee considers my personal opinions of any moment in this matter, I am perfectly willing to talk frank and openly, provided the press are excluded from the room.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, you know it has been charged here before this committee that instead of the American Federation of Labor really being behind this strike it has been incited by radical elements led by you, and that we are trying to get at what you know.

Senator McKELLAR. Then, I want to call attention to the fact that it was testified to by my good friend, Mr. Gompers—and I tried to find it, and we can refer to the record as to just what was said—that he understood that your views on the subject of anarchy and radicalism and so on had been changed.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Gompers was right.

Senator McKELLAR. Then do you believe in this doctrine?

Mr. FOSTER. How far they have been changed I am not going to make an issue in this campaign if I can help it.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, the thing I want to ask you is this—and I think it is but fair to have an answer yes or no to the question, which I have repeatedly asked you, and then you can make any explanation you wish. Just answer the question whether you now honestly and sincerely believe the doctrine of revolution just as you put it in this book, on page 3, which has been read to you?

Mr. FOSTER. I will try to make myself clear: That as far as this committee is concerned I have not the least objection in the world to answering any question you may desire to put in regard to that book or anything else I have written, and I am satisfied I would get a square deal from the committee; but I will not, or I do not believe I should in the interest of those men, make any statement here that is going to be heralded around and misconstrued in the newspapers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Have not these statements in your book been heralded through the country?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not really think they have helped your cause, do you? Maybe that is not a fair question. But if your only objection is to heralding them around, they have been heralded around. If you have changed your mind about those things we would be glad to know it.

Senator McKELLAR. And if you have not changed your mind we ought to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. I say I have, but I also say this: That the trade-unions movement is based on certain economic principles, the common economic interest of the workers, and I have strictly adhered to that proposition. I have never brought in any outside issues. The question of politics I never mention, the question of religion, the question of morality, the question of ethics, the question of new forms of organization I have not touched on. I have not in this work used my own opinions in any way, sense, or form; this campaign has been conducted strictly upon the principles laid down by the American Federation of Labor, and I say again that the attempts to make my personal opinions an issue are being made for the purpose of defeating the hopes of 350,000 steel workers, and I think they are entitled to some protection.

The CHAIRMAN. Even if that is true as you say, yet the issue is here, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the issue is here.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been made?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it has been made.

The CHAIRMAN. That instead of this being a strike to remedy conditions it is a strike to practically injure the institutions of the country, led by the I. W. W's. and radicals?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That issue has been made, and that is why the committee is going into it. The committee did not make the issue, it has been made by witnesses here.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that. I do not object to the committee going into it; but I do object to a lot of biased newspapers lying about me and lying about our movement as they have done since the inception of this campaign. Now, it is my judgment that a repudiation of that pamphlet, as a whole, and a general statement that I do not subscribe to the doctrines in it is sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you make that statement?

Mr. FOSTER. I do.

Senator McKELLAR. When did you change your mind about it?

Mr. FOSTER. I will state again that in my opinion the changes in my mind have nothing to do with this campaign here. I do not inject my personal opinion; my personal opinion is of no influence in this matter at all.

Senator McKELLAR. You said the strike was being conducted according to direction from the American Federation of Labor, I understood you?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I did not say that. The strike is being conducted according to the principles of the American Federation of Labor.

Senator McKELLAR. Did not the president of the American Federation of Labor advise you and others connected with the strike and organizing the strike to postpone it?

Mr. FOSTER. Provided that no injury would come to the cause of the steel workers.

Senator McKELLAR. And so you concluded that injury would come to the cause of the steel workers?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not; the committee did.

Senator McKELLAR. The committee of which you are secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir. I might say this further. I don't know whether I make it clear or not. I might have certain ideas—I dare say that President Gompers does not agree with the American Federation of Labor in all its details, because he is only one, although a very influential one, and there are features that I do not agree with; but in my work in the Federation I have religiously and scrupulously avoided presenting any ideas that departed in the remotest from the established customs and principles of the American Federation of Labor. For this reason: That I think the method and system being pursued by the American Federation of Labor are those best calculated to improve the lot of American workmen. In this campaign I am willing to stand or fall on what I have done—not what I think but what I have done. In this campaign there has not been a line written, there has not been a word said, there has not been a thing done that could be objected to by any organization that I have any knowledge of—and I have been very careful to see that that should be the state of affairs.

I want to say, further, something in regard to another phase of the matter—a ground that somebody might be interested in saying, “Well, now, you are becoming an influence in this industry; if you are a dangerous man we ought to know what plan you have got in mind. Possibly up to this time you have not done any of these things, but probably way back in your head there is some plan in mind that you can hold in abeyance for years to come.”

Now, I think if that suspicion is lodged in anybody's mind, on that ground alone they would have a right to inquire into my personal opinions; but if that suspicion is not there I do not think they have that right.

I want to say this, that I am in the steel industry purely as an organizer, and when that phase work is passed, the organizing phase of the work is passed, I am out of it. I am not in it any longer.

Senator STERLING. Have you ever worked in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. I am an organizer for my international unions.

Senator STERLING. But did you ever work in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. Not in the steel industry, no.

Senator STERLING. What is your international?

Mr. FOSTER. The car men. We are the men who have jurisdiction over the steel car work, the men who make steel cars.

Senator WALSH. I was going to say, Mr. Foster, that your personal opinion and you, as to whether they are objectionable or un-American, can be of consequence to this committee to the extent to which you personally entertain objectionable views, and to the extent that they may have influenced other men or have been a factor in influencing the strikers, and that may be of consequence, and that is why the Senator has a right to ask you a question as to what extent they have been promulgated.

Senator BORAH. May I also say that there are some members of this committee who have deep sympathy with union labor and unionism, but who are utterly at war with any theory of their accomplishing their means through violence. I am one of them.

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). I am another.

Senator BORAH. And I understand quite well your views. Now, if you have changed your views radically from those expressed in

that pamphlet, you could not render any greater service to your fellow workmen to help the cause and to secure favorable consideration at the hands of the public generally than by stating just to what extent you have changed your views. These are times when men change their views very rapidly, and they are not blamed very much for it, either. But I will say that I would be deeply prejudiced against anything you say before this committee—in fact, I could not entertain it, if I thought you still entertained the views set forth in this pamphlet.

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated to you gentlemen that I do not.

Senator BORAH. I want you to be frank. The public will get it through the newspapers as you state it. The editorial comment may not be favorable, but the reporters will send it out as you state it. Now, if the facts go out, you ought to be content with the facts, and the facts will go out just as you state it to the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I question it very much, Mr. Senator.

Senator McKELLAR. I do not think you need to.

Senator BORAH. Some of us have been condemned for the last six months in the editorial pages, but in sending out the facts, those facts have generally bone out accurately.

Senator PHIPPS. I think, Mr. Foster, that the committee would like to know that they have the later issue of this book.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was about 1911 or the early part of 1912: something like that.

Senator PHIPPS. It must have been later than that. I read the book and I know that there are at least two quotations made, one from the year 1912 and one quotation from the year 1914.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Senator McKELLAR. These are some of the expressions that trouble the committee:

In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies the syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are "fair," "just," or "civilized" than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. He knows he is engaged in a life and death struggle with an absolutely lawless and unscrupulous enemy and considers his tactics only from the standpoint of their effectiveness. With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be "legal" and "moral" or not does not concern him so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemy, and considers himself about as much bound by them as a householder would himself by regulations regarding burglary adopted by an association of house-breakers. Consequently, he ignores them in so far as he is able and it suits his purposes. He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalists' conceptions of "legality," "fairness," "right," etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies have; and then to wrest from them by force the industries they have stolen from him by force and duplicity, and to put an end forever to the wages system. He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strikes.

In view of that statement, I would like to have, if it was the truth that they were your views, whether in your part in conducting this strike you are still animated by the views expressed in the paragraph I have read to you, or do you no longer entertain those views?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that I do not.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state this, Mr. Chairman: if I may, in connection with this book, I was asked when was the date of the last issue. So far as I know, the date of the last issue was somewhere in 1911 or so, but within the last few weeks there have been thousands and thousands

of copies circulated all through the steel district—who by I do not know—everybody has received them. I see the one that the Senator has is one of those books with a white notice pasted on there, and the only—

Senator WALSH. What was the white notice?

Mr. FOSTER. There it is, you can see it.

Senator PHIPPS. I got mine from the Library. I sent to the Library for it. I suppose it came from there.

Mr. FOSTER. One page I notice, the original book sold for 10 cents, and it shows the cheapness of the tactics of the men we are opposed to. They have raised the price to 25 cents to try to put me in the light of being a grafter or making money out of the sale of the book.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean to intimate by that that some of the mill owners have secured copies of the book and had them republished for distribution.

Mr. FOSTER. I can not prove it.

Senator PHIPPS. But you give that intimation.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I would create that impression, most assuredly.

Mr. RUBIN. Gentlemen of the committee, I have a letter here from Judge Alschuler, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Chicago, touching Mr. Foster and his views. It amounts to almost a judicial finding and I want to read the letter.

CHICAGO, ILL., March 28, 1919.

MR. JOHN FITZPATRICK,

166 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I have your favor of yesterday stating that Mr. W. Z. Foster is engaged in organization work in the east for the American Federation of Labor, and that it is charged he is "an irresponsible, unreasonable and destructive agitator," and asking me to express such impression of him as came to me through coming into contact with him in various proceedings before me in my capacity of United States Administrator appointed by the Government for the period of the war to arbitrate labor differences in certain of the packing-house industries of the country.

In reply I will say that yours is not the first communication of this nature concerning Mr. Foster which has come to me, and I can answer you only to the same effect as I have others.

My acquaintance with Mr. Foster began in February, 1918, with the hearing of the first arbitration in which he seemed to act as an adviser to the representatives of the employees, and was apparently relied on for the production of documents, figures, and references as they were wanted in the hearing. After that award was made many questions arose, both as to interpretation and compliance, which necessitated many hearings of grievances, wherein Mr. Foster often represented the employees, until the middle or latter part of the summer when I was informed he left for the East, and since which time I have not met him.

In his representation of the employees in the various controversies before me in which he participated he impressed me as being particularly intelligent, honorable, moderate, tactful, and fair. His manner of presentation and his occasional apt literary references led me to inquire of others as to his early advantages, and I learned with some wonder that they were absolutely nil, and on the contrary all the very reverse of advantages. If in his earlier wanderings he imbibed for a time fantastic, extreme, and destructive social ideas, I am sure there was nothing developed in the many conferences and hearings in which he participated which would indicate that he still harbored them.

Respectfully, yours,

SAMUEL ALSCHULER.

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Foster, do you still feel that you are what you yourself call a syndicalist?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Senator McKELLAR. How was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Senator McKELLAR. I want to read to you this paragraph, and what I desire to read to you is on page 28 of the pamphlet:

The syndicalist, on the other hand, is strictly an antistatist. He considers the State a meddling capitalist institution. He resists its tyrannical interference in his affairs as much as possible, and proposes to exclude it from the future society. He is a radical opponent of "law and order," as he knows that for his unions to be "legal" in their tactics would be for them to become impotent. He recognizes no rights of the capitalists to their property, and is going to strip them of it, law or no law.

Now, as I understand you, you wrote that some years ago, but do not now believe in it.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I would have to condemn that. I say this much, that to try to enter into any explanation is futile. With this committee alone I will talk for a week, but I can not talk to the newspapers. I say that because I know I have been quoted at length things that I never said.

Senator McKELLAR. You can not be misquoted here. There is not a member of this committee that would permit you to be misquoted.

Senator STERLING. When did you first repudiate the doctrine laid down in this book?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. I asked when did you first repudiate the doctrine laid down in this book?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, that is a matter of growth.

Senator STERLING. Oh, a matter of growth. Well, can not you fix about the time when you underwent your change in views in regard to these questions, and in regard to the propositions involved in what the Senator just read you, radical as that is?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I could not say that. Some of that I would still believe. Some of it I would not.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Which of it would you believe? I think it is very important for the committee to know which you believe and which you do not. I understood you to say that you did not believe in it, and if I am mistaken I would like to be corrected, and I think that the committee would like to know that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to read that. What page is that?

Senator McKELLAR. The first is on page 3 and the last is on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the question before us?

Senator McKELLAR. My question is how much of that do you still maintain and how much of it do you disagree with, of the part that I referred to?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe I could defend any of that. I would not defend any of that. [Referring to red pamphlet.]

Senator BORAH. You are no longer a believer in the principles of syndicalism?

Mr. FOSTER. As expressed in that I am not.

Senator STERLING. Are you a believer in syndicalism in any form?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is the true expression.

Senator STERLING. You think that expresses the fundamentals of syndicalism, do you?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the word syndicalism merely means unionism.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Senator BORAH. In popular parlance it has taken a well-defined meaning that we all understand, of course.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is the popular understanding.

Senator BORAH. You say in conducting this strike you have not advocated violence or bloodshed, or anything of that kind?

Mr. FOSTER. Most assuredly not.

Senator BORAH. And it is not your intention to do so?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course not.

Senator BORAH. If you are still a believer in the doctrines of that book there would be no reason why you should not resort to violence?

Mr. FOSTER. If I was still a believer in that book and tried to use it and put it into practice I would not be in the position I am in.

Senator BORAH. Is it your purpose to conduct this strike in good faith, according to the principles of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator BORAH. Are you in consultation with, and acting under the advice and counsel of such men as Mr. Gompers, and the men who are at the head of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my work has been subjected to the most careful scrutiny of the biggest men in the American Federation of Labor, and I am certain if there was anything about it that was off color that my activities would have suddenly come to an end. In fact I have told President Gompers himself that at any time he felt my conduct was such that it did not harmonize with the principles of the Federation that all he had to do was to merely drop a hint and I would be only too glad to retire.

Senator BORAH. In other words, if the time should ever come in the conduct of this strike when your views as to how it should be conducted might conflict with the views of Mr. Gompers, would you yield to his views?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator BORAH. Then, if there might by reason of your previous belief, be an unconscious adherence still to the doctrines as laid down in the red pamphlet, your association with Mr. Gompers and your dependence upon his advice has been such that it enables you to say that you propose to conduct this strike according to the principles of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not quite catch that, Senator.

Senator BORAH. You propose to follow, notwithstanding any previous opinions or beliefs, the principles and policies of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely. My personal opinions are not involved here at all.

Senator BORAH. Have you sought or are you seeking now in any way to inculcate in the minds of the laboring men in the steel industry the views which are contained in that red pamphlet?

Mr. FOSTER. Not a bit.

Senator BORAH. Have you at any time undertaken to do that?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; positively not. To complete that answer, I might state that every line that has been sent out of my office has had to bear the scrutiny of all kinds of detectives and people of that

character; it has been scattered broadcast over the country, and they know very well what is coming out of my office.

Senator BORAH. How long have you been engaged in the present work of organizing the steel industry—the work in which you are now engaged?

Mr. FOSTER. A little over a year.

Senator BORAH. During that time have you advocated any of the doctrines that are found in this pamphlet among the men?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Senator BORAH. During that time has the American Federation of Labor found fault with your teachings or principles in any way?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no teachings or principles. I apply the principles of the American Federation of Labor as best I understand them, with the censorship of 24 very intelligent, very alert, and responsible international presidents.

Senator BORAH. You say to this committee, then, that in performing your duty there as an organizer you are acting exclusively under the direction and under the principles of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. When was your book on trade-unionism published?

Mr. FOSTER. That was three or four years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Three or four years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. About that.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any reprint of it in the last few years?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you announce any of the same doctrines in your book on trade-unionism that you announced in your red pamphlet?

Mr. FOSTER. There may be a remnant of it left; I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. But you think it is not as radical?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever views you expressed in that book on trade-unionism you still hold, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not read it for a couple of years. I am one who changes his mind once in a while. I might say that other people do, too. I shook hands with Gustave Herve in La Sante Prison. At that time he was in there for antimilitarism and for preaching sabotage, and to-day I think Gustave Herve is one of the biggest men in France. I would like to say this: It isn't that I care, but I know that no matter what I say it will be misconstrued. It is bound to be misconstrued.

Mr. GOMPERS. They can not say anything worse of you than they have said.

Senator BORAH. Misconstruction is not a bad thing sometimes, if you can just keep being construed and not lose your identity. You will find that out, that all you have got to do is to state your views, and you will finally get them before the public.

The CHAIRMAN. It was stated here by a witness, I think by Mr. Gompers, that you were a delegate to the convention at Budapest of the I. W. W.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.



The CHAIRMAN. And that you had some controversy there with a Mr. Duncan, which matter afterwards came up in the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were the representative of the I. W. W. at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was 1910 or 1911.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not go to Paris at that time as a representative of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir. I went there as an individual.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you still a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. How long since did you cease to be a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. About nine years; eight or nine years.

Senator STERLING. You were representing the I. W. W. at Budapest in 1911, were you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you immediately sever your connections with the I. W. W. after the Budapest convention?

Mr. FOSTER. I did.

Senator STERLING. You did?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You represented them there, however, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That was eight years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. When did you first become a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. Two or three years before that.

Senator STERLING. Two or three years before?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, a couple of years.

Senator STERLING. Do you know an I. W. W. publication called The Labor Defender?

Mr. FOSTER. I never heard of it.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of an I. W. W. publication called The Rebel Worker?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have heard of that.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever contribute anything to The Rebel Worker, any articles or anything?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know an I. W. W. publication called Solidarity?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You have contributed to that, have you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How recently?

Mr. FOSTER. About 8 or 9 years ago.

Senator STERLING. Now, Mr. Foster, you say that you organized the car men's union?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I belong to it.

Senator STERLING. You belong to it but did not organize it?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Senator STERLING. Then you have been a worker, have you, among the car men?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been engaged in that employment?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, several years.

Senator STERLING. What is your particular work with the car men?

Mr. FOSTER. I am a car inspector.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever work in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a machinist by trade?

Mr. FOSTER. No, a car inspector.

Senator McKELLAR. A car inspector?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that regarded as skilled employment?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. They get the highest rate paid the mechanics on the railroads; the highest standard rate.

Senator McKELLAR. How long have you worked at that trade?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I would say probably five years.

Senator McKELLAR. And for what railroads?

Mr. FOSTER. The Chicago North Western.

Senator McKELLAR. When was that?

Mr. FOSTER. That was about from 1911 on.

Senator McKELLAR. 1911 to 1916?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not work entirely for the Chicago North Western Railroad. I worked in the stockyards and for the Soo Line.

Senator McKELLAR. For what other line?

Mr. FOSTER. The Soo Line.

Senator STERLING. You organized the stockyards union at Chicago, did you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you have any work to do in connection with the organizing of that union?

Mr. FOSTER. I worked with them?

Senator STERLING. Oh, you worked with them?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Were you a member of that union?

Mr. FOSTER. I was.

Senator STERLING. Were you associated with a man by the name of Hanson in organizing the stockyards union?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know the name.

Senator STERLING. You do not know him?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know him.

Senator STERLING. You do not recall such a person interested with you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Were there some people assisting in that organization whose names you did not know?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes. They all help, you know.

Senator WALSH. What was your attitude toward this country during the war? I would just like to ask that question for the

record. I assume, of course, that every American citizen has been loyal.

Mr. FOSTER. My attitude toward the war was that it must be won at all costs.

Senator WALSH. Some reference was made by Mr. Fitzpatrick about your purchasing bonds or your subscribing to some campaign fund. Do you mind telling the committee just what you did personally in that direction.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I did the same as everyone else.

Senator WALSH. What was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I bought my share, what I figured I was able to afford, and in our union we did our best to help make the loans a success.

Senator WALSH. Did you make speeches?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. How many?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, dozens of them.

Senator WALSH. This is important. Judge Gary said here, and he has a lot of sympathy in this country with his statement, that he did not propose to sit down and discuss the labor strike with a man who entertained the views that your red book contains. He has a lot of sympathy for that. A lot of people agree with him. Probably members of this committee agree with him. Now if you have changed your views, if you are a loyal American and you do not believe in these isms, I think the quicker you can get that before us, the quicker you can show us that you are a loyal American, the better it will be and the more it will help, not yourself, but the workmen who may be injured by your radicalism.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not object to answering any question about the war at all, but when I am asked "What is your attitude toward the State; what is your attitude toward religion; what is your attitude toward ethics," and questions of that character, I do not think I should be required to answer them. What was your last question?

Senator WALSH. This relates to your attitude toward American institutions, and that is why this question may be proper where the questions you spoke of may not be. I would like to have you, for the sake of the record, tell us how many speeches you made, what time you devoted, and what money you expended for bonds, for the Red Cross or for any other purpose?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think I bought either \$450 or \$500 worth of bonds during the war. I can not say exactly.

Senator WALSH. You made speeches for the sale of bonds?

Mr. FOSTER. We carried on a regular campaign in our organization in the stock yards.

Senator WALSH. And your attitude was the same as the attitude of all the other members of your organization?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you at any time, publicly or privately, prior to this date repudiated the doctrines contained in this red book?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say my work has been such for the last couple of years that nobody has even questioned me about it.

Senator McKELLAR. So that up to date, up to the time that I asked you the question a while ago, you had never either publicly

or privately repudiated the doctrines in this book, so far as you know?

Mr. FOSTER. Only through my activities. I may have at times said probably the same thing, but as to going into any extended repudiation of it, I have never done that.

Senator McKELLAR. You never have? Speaking of the war, what is your age?

Mr. FOSTER. Thirty-nine.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you drafted?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir. That is, I was in the last draft. I was not drafted.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you mustered into the service?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Why not?

Mr. FOSTER. Because I was married.

Senator McKELLAR. You claimed exemption on the ground that you were married?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know, Mr. Foster, one Jake Margolas, a representative of the I. W. W. in this country, and here from abroad?

Mr. FOSTER. I know James Margolas, attorney for the metals union in Pittsburgh.

Senator STERLING. He has been the legal representative, has he not, of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Senator STERLING. You do not know. Have you had occasion to have conferences with Mr. Margolas recently, at or about the time of the beginning of this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. He came into my office once, yes.

Senator STERLING. He came into your office last August?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the same as he goes into every labor office in Pittsburgh.

Senator STERLING. He was in your office last August, August of 1919?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know. August? No, sir.

Senator STERLING. How recently was he there?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, three or four months ago, I guess.

Senator STERLING. You do not know anything about his connection with the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. Only what I read in the newspapers about it.

Senator STERLING. Well, you do know from reading in the newspapers that he is the legal representative of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I do not know that he is.

Senator STERLING. Have you heard it said that he was? Have you ever heard it stated that he was?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I can not say I have. I know he acts in most cases of that character, but I will say I do not know whether he has ever acted for any of them.

Mr. LUPIN. May I make a statement in this connection? Mr. Margolas was an attorney in Pittsburgh; when I came in the Pittsburgh field I thought of employing him, because he did effective work for the molder strikers in 1916. Mr. Foster objected to my employing Mr. Margolas because of his views.

Senator STERLING. Yes. Mr. Foster evidently knew something about Mr. Margolas at that time.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Foster, I think it would be well to have you give the committee a little idea as to the present working and living conditions that have been complained of and that are stated to be the basis and cause of this strike.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as I am concerned, I do not know that I could qualify as an expert in that matter. I do know this: That in the steel districts in Pennsylvania, the cities of Homestead and Braddock and Rankin and McKeesport, where the steel workers live, they are little better than collections of hovels, as they could hardly else be on the wages the men are receiving.

Senator PHIPPS. How do the wages the men are receiving compare with the wages in other industries in that manufacturing center?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that depends. The organized workers, of course, receive better money. In McKeesport, for example, the laborers in the building trades, who are identically the same class of men, get 80 cents an hour. The laborers in the mill get 40 cents an hour—one-half as much.

Senator PHIPPS. You are in charge of the organizing of the men in all of these districts for the purpose of this contest. How many organizers report to you, as secretary of the committee?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, in order to understand that, you have got to know that each of these international unions send their own organizers in there, and these organizers are hired by them, paid by them, and controlled by them, and they do not report to me. There are many of that type of organizer. Each international union has its quota.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know approximately how many organizers have been engaged?

Mr. FOSTER. In this work?

Senator PHIPPS. In this work, during the past few months.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there are quite a number. Mr. Tighe says his organization has 20.

Mr. TIGHE. Nearly that, I guess.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know there were that many.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, as to their compensation compared to what the workers in the mills receive, how are they paid?

Mr. FOSTER. Each union pays a different rate. Some pay \$7 a day and expenses; some \$6; some \$8 and expenses.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any objection to stating what your own salary is?

Mr. FOSTER. My salary is \$8 a day and expenses, exactly the same as paid to American Federation of Labor organizers.

Senator PHIPPS. When a strike is on and the men are out on strike and draw strike benefits, how is that based, what do they receive?

Mr. FOSTER. That is according to the laws of the respective organizations. Some have some regulations and others have other regulations.

Senator PHIPPS. As a rule, is it less than the amount the man would be receiving in his daily work?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, far less.

Senator PHIPPS. Far less?

Mr. FOSTER. Much less. Not over 25 per cent, as a rule, I should imagine.

Senator PHIPPS. About 25 per cent, you think, of what they would receive?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not estimate it, but offhand I would say that.

Senator PHIPPS. When a strike is on, is there any reduction in the wages paid the organizers, or do they draw the same rates that they do when there is no strike on?

Mr. FOSTER. When a strike is on I believe that more times than not the organizer will go short. Of all the strikes that have been had in America, I believe more times than not the organizers have not been paid. I know that our officials for many years often went without any salaries whatever.

Senator PHIPPS. Under the present situation, you have stated that there are about 2,000,000 members of the 24 international associations. Those members have paid an initiation of \$3 per head, have they not?

Mr. FOSTER. No; these 2,000,000 men are members affiliated with these. That is not counting those in the steel industry. Those in the steel industry have paid the \$3 per head.

Senator PHIPPS. But these 24 international unions have recognized the strike, have they not—they are standing behind the men who are out on strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, those members paid dues of \$2.75 per quarter?

Mr. FOSTER. They vary. Every union is different.

Senator PHIPPS. To what extent would there be a variation in the dues?

Mr. FOSTER. They run from 50 cents a month to three or four dollars a month.

Senator PHIPPS. If we were to take an average of a dollar a month, would that be about fair?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that would be all right.

Senator PHIPPS. Suppose we put it even a little lower than that. With 2,000,000 members, figuring at \$10 a year, you would have in the course of a year \$20,000,000 for the purposes of conducting the operations of these organizations, would you not?

Mr. FOSTER. You would; but you have got to understand how that money is applied. Probably 75 per cent of those dues would never get beyond the local unions. They are used for local purposes of the men themselves; only a small percentage goes to the international for their general expenses. So it would not be anywhere near \$20,000,000.

Senator PHIPPS. But say it was \$20,000,000. Three-quarters of that would be \$15,000,000 to use among the locals. That would be more than could possibly be required for the payment of the organizers and the expenses of secretaries and other headquarters upkeep?

Mr. FOSTER. When you consider that there are 40,000 local unions or more in this country, a few million dollars does not spread very thick over it, especially as they have paid secretaries and business agents and heavy expenses of all sorts.

Senator PHIPPS. In a statement made this morning, I believe by Mr. Tighe, which is confirmatory of one made the other day by

Mr. Gompers, they expressed themselves as being opposed to a bonus system. I believe Judge Gary in his testimony yesterday referred to that as a special compensation, where the Steel Corporation recognizes superior ability or superior service on the part of an employee. What is your view on that subject, as to that special compensation?

Mr. FOSTER. My experience with the bonus system is that it is very unsatisfactory to the worker. It is a system of speeding them up. It is a system of speeding them up to reduce to final terms of piece-work system.

Senator PHIPPS. In fixing the compensation of the organizers, it has been stated that the organizers—not stated in this testimony here, but the statement has been made outside—that the organizers are paid \$1 per head for every new member they secure for an organization. What is your answer to that?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not true. The organization committee, the organizing fund, receives a dollar for each member that is organized.

Senator PHIPPS. The organizing fund receives it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And the organizers are paid out of that fund rather than out of local dues, are they?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; the organizers themselves are paid by the international unions. The use of the local funds is for business agents and local men.

Senator PHIPPS. At the time this present strike was under consideration and a date was agreed upon, providing the men decided that they desired the strike, were the different locals presented with copies of the demands that were to be made upon the employers?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And that formed the basis of their ballot, did it, whether or not they favored the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose so. They were all furnished copies. They understood what they were voting on.

Senator PHIPPS. Your reports on the strike vote came in the form of communications from the different international organizations to the effect that a certain percentage of their men had voted for a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And in making that report we are told that the number of men who had voted was not stated.

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes it was, and other times not; but, as a rule, it was not.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe we have been promised, for the purpose of our report here, the actual vote report from each of the organizations. As secretary of the committee, will you see that this committee is furnished with that information, please?

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the vote from each organization? I do not know whether I can get it. I can ask for it.

Senator PHIPPS. It must be in the records of the local organizations if the vote were taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I personally have no authority over such matters as that. I could ask for it, and if they could compile it—

Mr. LUPIN. We have heeded your request; we are trying to get it for you.

Senator PHIPPS. All right. Now, in calling this strike, we are told that there was no distinction made between plants of the steel corporation and plants not affiliated with the steel corporation, not owned by them; that it was a steel strike; that all of the workers were requested to go out on September 22. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is not right.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your understanding of the situation as to calling the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. The strike was called on all steel mills in America not working under union agreements.

Senator PHIPPS. That is just stating the same thing in a little different form. That is the question I really meant to ask. Then, what plan of placing before these independent companies the demands of the men for recognition was followed?

Mr. FOSTER. There were two plans followed. One was the individual organizations approached them in many instances, and then the committee as a whole sent them a request for a conference, each and every independent one. There may be some that were affected that we did not get to hear of, but all the large independents, at least.

Senator PHIPPS. Are we to understand from that that none of these independents complied with your request for a conference?

Mr. FOSTER. There were some that did.

Senator PHIPPS. What happened in sequence?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not take part in those conferences and could not say. Representatives of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers met with officials of various companies, I understand.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not know whether those companies acceded to the 12 demands presented to them?

Mr. FOSTER. I am pretty sure they did not.

Senator PHIPPS. You are sure they did not?

Mr. FOSTER. I know in one or two cases they did—small concerns.

Senator PHIPPS. But in the larger cases, the majority of the cases, perhaps, the 12 demands were not acceded to?

Mr. FOSTER. That is true.

Senator PHIPPS. And the result was a strike in those plants?

Mr. FOSTER. The result was a strike.

Senator PHIPPS. So that even where you had a conference with these independent steel producers, the net result was the same—the strike was called?

Mr. FOSTER. The situation in that regard is this: From the information I have got, these were very small concerns, and they felt that they had to go along and do what the big fellow did anyhow, and they simply said, "Well, we will have to let the strike affect us the same as him, because he dominates the industry, and whatever he does we will have to do."

Senator PHIPPS. How about the Colorado Fuel & Iron plant in my State of Colorado, where checking by the 12 demands with information that was read into the Congressional Record the other day revealed that the company was already conceding practically all that the men were asking for under these 12 demands?

Mr. FOSTER. All except the first one. I did not say all, either, but they did not concede the first demand, the right of collective bargaining.



Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean by collective bargaining that the men in a plant in Colorado, which is the only steel plant—you may say, the only one you would class as a big steel plant in Colorado, at least, although they are permitted to, and do, as a matter of fact, bargain with their employers over the wage scales, labor conditions and other things, that because the company would not agree that they should bargain in connection with steel plants in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, that therefore collective bargaining was not permissible?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean they were dissatisfied with that system they had there for many reasons. I do not know, that might be one of them that you state, but they are thoroughly dissatisfied with it, and they make that as one of their demands, the abolition of these company unions.

Senator PHIPPS. The abolition of the company unions?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. They had a company union at Pueblo?

Mr. FOSTER. That is what we call a company union.

Senator PHIPPS. How about the Bethlehem Steel Co. plants? They were not called out on September 22, I believe?

Mr. FOSTER. They were called out, but there was a misunderstanding.

Senator PHIPPS. Then a new and later date was agreed upon and the men were called out a week later, I believe, Monday of this week, to be exact?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. That is correct?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Previous to that calling out, was there a request for a conference with the officials of the Bethlehem Co.?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that refused?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. They declined to confer with representatives of the A. F. of L., did they?

Mr. FOSTER. Representatives of these international unions—yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How was the ballot taken in the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant?

Mr. FOSTER. They all voted according to their laws. I do not know how they voted. They reported a vote was taken, and that is all the information I get on it.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not send out the ballots from the Pittsburgh headquarters?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You do send out from Pittsburgh headquarters to the plants in that district, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Send out what?

Senator PHIPPS. The ballots for voting?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You send out circulars over the Pittsburgh district from the headquarters in the city, do you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; we sent our circulars.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know about how many circulars of the issue known as Circular No. 2 were sent out to the men?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know it by the number.

Senator PHIPPS. It would be a large number, would it?

Mr. FOSTER. It probably would. I do not recognize the circular by the number. If you could tell me what was in it—

Senator PHIPPS. No; I have never seen the circular. I merely heard that the circular No. 2 was sent out rather generally. You do not know in what manner the workmen at the Bethlehem plant were polled?

Mr. FOSTER. I do know this, that at the meeting of the national committee, where the strike was decided upon in the Bethlehem plants, that the representatives of the different organizations stated that the matter had been handled in accordance with their laws. Outside of that I had no right to any information.

Senator PHIPPS. And the strike call was made locally then by the union, was it, their local union?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; the strike was issued from Pittsburgh on behalf of these international representatives.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that based on their report to you that the men had voted in favor of the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; they do not report to me. They report to themselves, to each other, and the matter is thrashed out and action decided upon.

Senator PHIPPS. What I am trying to get at, Mr. Foster, is the method.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I understand.

Senator PHIPPS. You stated the call was issued from Pittsburgh. Now, what did you base your action on when they sent that call out?

Mr. FOSTER. They instructed me to send it out.

Senator PHIPPS. I hold in my hand a circular headed "Iron and Steel Workers," on which appears the name of your chairman, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and your own name as secretary-treasurer, addressed to the Bethlehem steel workers, and ask you if that is a copy of the strike order that you referred to?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this is not the strike order. The official strike order was sent by our committee to the local representatives in Bethlehem.

Senator PHIPPS. But this was printed by your Pittsburgh office, was it not, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. It was printed by the local men in Bethlehem.

Senator PHIPPS. I think you said it was sent out from Pittsburgh?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this is not sent out from Pittsburgh. The strike call was a telegram sent to the different points, and this was printed in Bethlehem—that is, they had charge of that. We did not send this out ourselves. I will state, though, that these circulars got into the hands of the men before the strike order was sent out, and the reason for that was this, they expected—the men were in such a frame of mind that they expected they would strike, and they had these printed in anticipation of that. Of course, if there had been no strike these would all have been destroyed, but it seems that some one leaked and it got out; and the company got hold of a number of them in some way.

Senator PHIPPS. Will you identify that for us, if you please, Mr. Foster? I submit this for the record.

(The document referred to is here printed in full, as follows:)

IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

[John Fitzpatrick, chairman, Chicago, Ill.; William Z. Foster, secretary-treasurer, Pittsburgh, Pa.]

PITTSBURGH, PA., September 25, 1919.

BETHLEHEM STEEL WORKERS—STRIKE CALLED SEPTEMBER 29, 1919.

All men employed by the Bethlehem Steel Corporation are requested to lay down their tools beginning at 6 o'clock on the morning of Monday, September 29, and refuse to resume their employment until such time as the Steel Corporation concedes the demands of the organizations.

For months the employees of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation in the shipyards of this company have enjoyed a solid union agreement, signed by President E. G. Grace, of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, with the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor. Wage rate guaranteed and paid easily average 60 per cent higher than is paid by the same company in the steel mills. The shipyard employees secured these concessions by organizing and making a stand. We believe the employees of the steel mills are entitled to the same conditions and wages.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. has absolutely refused to meet the conference committee of the national committee to take up the grievances of the employees of the five plants located at Sparrows Point, Md., Steelton, Lebanon, Reading, and Bethlehem, Pa.

The time has come to bring about the same working conditions in the steel mills as are granted to the employees of the ship yards, railroads, and navy yards.

Stay away from all of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation plants on Monday, September 29.

Protect your organizations against any violence being used, and see that the strike is carried on in a peaceful manner.

The American Federation of Labor has won all its great progress by peaceful and legal means. Stop work September 29.

National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers.

Senator PHIPPS. When did your national committee in Pittsburgh receive advice from Bethlehem that the men favored a strike, on what date?

Mr. FOSTER. I should imagine it was at least a month before the strike was declared.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; but I am trying now to locate the time when the calling of the strike for September 29 was determined upon. You had a communication from Bethlehem, you tell us?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. That had to do with calling a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. And you responded to that by authorizing them to call a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Our committee met and heard the reports from Bethlehem and canvassed the organizations as to what position they took on this, and the result was that they declared in favor of a strike.

Senator PHIPPS. On what date was that conference or meeting held?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that was about the 26th.

Senator PHIPPS. The 26th of September?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; either the 25th or the 26th.

Senator PHIPPS. And your communication then went back to them on what date?

Mr. FOSTER. About the same date. But I will say this in connection with that, we had several meetings on the Bethlehem situation. We realized the importance of the matter, and we had to discuss it at length. We had a meeting on the 24th, I believe it was, and took the matter up, but did not arrive at any definite conclusions in regard to it, and we took it up again on the 26th. The impression was that the Bethlehem strike order would be issued on the 25th; most of them expected that it would; but matters transpired that it was not issued at that time, and we held a further meeting on it—two further meetings, in fact—before the order was finally issued on or about the 27th, I think.

Senator PHIPPS. You think the 27th?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe it was Friday or Saturday.

Senator PHIPPS. The fact that this circular is dated Pittsburgh, Pa., September 25, with the address 303 Magee Building, was my reason for assuming this was printed in Pittsburgh.

Mr. FOSTER. This bears a union label of Reading, Pa. That is where it was printed.

Senator PHIPPS. No. 4 is Reading, Pa., is it?

Mr. FOSTER. It says that right in there.

Senator PHIPPS. But where is your printing done, I mean your general printing, these circulars I have referred to, one that was referred to as No. 2?

Mr. FOSTER. We get our printing done almost entirely at the S. & S. Printing Co., Fifth Avenue.

Senator PHIPPS. Stephenson's?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; the name is just S. & S.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know how many ballots were printed there for use in the Pittsburgh district?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I could not tell, because all the organizations have their own ballots, practically.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Tighe would know that, perhaps.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. TIGHE. I could not tell. The way we sent out our ballots was we accompanied the ballots with a circular letter calling attention to certain provisions in our laws, then we got the number of members in the lodges and sent the number of ballots that we thought the lodge would use, but those ballots, I think, are all up in our office at the present time from those lodges that voted on it.

I want to say, Senator, in connection with this here, being as you asked the question, that the members of our organization, who at that time were in the organization, about 98 per cent of them voted for a strike. There was only one lodge in the whole list of them that voted against it. All the others voted for it.

Senator PHIPPS. That brings out a point that I had in mind, Mr. Tighe, if I may have your attention for just a moment. Then do we understand that in figuring percentages favoring the strike the vote is figured by lodges and not by ballots of the individual workmen?

Mr. TIGHE. Well, I want to say that as far as our organization was concerned, that while we give that as the average, the fact is the individual lodges voted that way. Some of them voted 100 per

cent; that is, the majority of them voted 100 per cent, and the 98 is just a variation.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, the figures, when submitted, will disclose that. What the committee really is interested in was to learn how many men had voted to strike and how many had voted against going on a strike.

Mr. Foster, I want to ask you whether or not you know of any union organizations that are incorporated, so that they might sue or be sued in the courts of the country?

Mr. FOSTER. None affiliated with the American Federation of Labor that I know of.

Mr. RUBIN. That is not necessary, Senator, to make them a party. It is not necessary in law to make them party plaintiff or defendant. Senator PHIPPS. Then why do they decline to incorporate?

Mr. RUBIN. That is for different reasons.

Senator PHIPPS. Can you state the reason, Mr. Rubin?

Mr. RUBIN. I think Mr. Gompers could answer that question better.

Mr. GOMPERS. I shall be very glad to state it if you will give me an opportunity.

Mr. RUBIN. I will refer it to Mr. Gompers.

Senator PHIPPS. I suppose there is no objection, is there, to have Mr. Gompers state why labor organizations do not incorporate?

Mr. GOMPERS. I would have to ask for a little time.

Mr. RUBIN. I should like to have you get through with Mr. Foster this afternoon, if possible, because he is going to get the witnesses that will come before this committee in Pittsburgh if you come there.

Senator PHIPPS. I think we understand what company unions are, Mr. Foster, if you agree with what has been stated with regard to company unions.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear that.

Senator PHIPPS. Company unions; that is, organizations near any particular place. You have nothing new to offer on that point, have you?

Mr. FOSTER. I had something to do with the company unions in the Cambria Steel Plant. I know that up there at Johnstown when they established the company unions there the men took an active interest in it and proceeded to elect live wires, men that they had confidence in, on the committee, and I know that every man that carried a union card and had independence enough to stand up and speak in behalf of the men was discharged, every man of this company union.

Senator PHIPPS. Was it the plan of that company union to affiliate with men in other plants, or to keep to themselves?

Mr. FOSTER. It was the Midvale-Cambria plant.

Senator PHIPPS. Now the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., whatever they call it now, has had a union of its own, has it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and 100 per cent affiliation with the American Federation of Labor.

Senator PHIPPS. They have 100 per cent affiliation now with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Their workers were called out on September 22?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. The same day as the others, although Bethlehem did not?

Mr. FOSTER. They did not have to be called out. They just rushed out. They were so thoroughly disgusted with the treatment they received from the Cambria Steel Co. that they could not be held any longer on the job.

Senator PHIPPS. Does this statement apply to the Johnstown plant, which is the Cambria, or also to the Coatesville?

Mr. FOSTER. The Johnstown plant is the big one, and it applies principally to that, although in both of those plants the men had grievous complaints. They discharged all of the live-wire men off of the company union, and reduced the committee to a body that they could manipulate the way they pleased, and then when they got it reduced to that state they took the committee down to Atlantic City and adopted a whole set of resolutions condemning this movement and condemning all wage movement or hour movement at this time and generally taking the company's position in the matter.

Senator STERLING. Have you a copy of those resolutions?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I have not. They appeared in the daily press at the time. I could get a copy.

Senator PHIPPS. I may have them here.

Mr. FOSTER. But the consequence of it was that the following week the men joined our organization to the extent of 2,500 men in one week in Johnstown as a protest against the action of the company union in stating that they did not want better conditions in the Johnstown plant.

Senator STERLING. What companies were represented at this meeting, do you know?

Mr. FOSTER. What companies?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Just the Midvale-Cambria chain of plants.

Senator STERLING. How many plants were involved?

Mr. FOSTER. Three.

Senator STERLING. You call it a chain of plants. How many plants were involved?

Mr. FOSTER. Three; that is all.

Senator STERLING. Just three plants?

Mr. FOSTER. Nicetown, Coatesville, and Johnstown.

Senator PHIPPS. I have here the resolutions and the report of what transpired at that meeting. It is very lengthy. I was going to submit it later for our information. I did not care to discuss it particularly.

Mr. FOSTER. In connection with that Cambria situation, I will state that we approached the Cambria Steel Co. asking for the reinstatement of the hundreds of men that were discharged there for belonging to the organization, and Mr. Corey, the president of the Cambria, gave us a written statement to the effect that the men could be represented either through the company plan of representation or through the committees elected, in any way that they saw fit. So we immediately took them up on that proposition, and the employees held open meetings in the city and elected a committee, and when that committee went in to see Mr. Corey they were flatly denied a conference. Mr. Corey stated that he had changed his mind and got to know the company plan of organization better, and then

to make the men thoroughly like it, members of the committee were discharged.

Senator PHIPPS. I would like to ask you, Mr. Foster, what is your personal attitude regarding sympathy strikes, so-called?

Mr. FOSTER. Sympathy strikes? We have consistently tried to make this an organized proposition. There has been no aim on the part of anyone, so far as I know, to stretch the thing over into other industries and create a general unorganized walkout. So far as agreements are concerned, we have been very careful to see that no trade should violate its agreement if we could stop it; that is, if the members of the committee could stop it. I can not see myself how sympathy strikes are going to help.

Senator PHIPPS. You have a situation to-day. I believe, in that the dock laborers and railway employees along the lake ports have gone out on strike in sympathy with this steel strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Any man who is working in the steel industry is not striking in sympathy. He is striking for his own benefit directly, and we consider those men as working in the steel industry absolutely.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, to your knowledge has this strike up to date extended outside of any of the branches of the steel industry, into other industries?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it has gone beyond rolling mills and blast furnaces. It has gone over to a small extent into foundries; men who have been attracted by the bigness of the movement have seized the occasion to present their own demands. But that is a very rare case. The strike is confined to the steel industry proper.

In connection with the figures that have been stated here, I want to say this that there are certain sections of the steel industry that are not affected by this strike, the iron mines and the coal mines, and then all the clerical forces are not even supposed to be affected in this strike. The United States Steel Corporation states that they have 262,000 men, and the probabilities are that half of them are not even affected by it. It is the strike in the rolling mills and blast furnaces, that section of the industry and that part of it. I think that an 80 per cent strike is a conservative estimate. I think there are more than 80 per cent of the men on strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Eighty per cent of about what number, in round figures? How many men do you estimate are employed in the steel industry who are directly affected at the present time by this strike movement?

Mr. FOSTER. Eighty per cent of what number—the total number of men?

Senator PHIPPS. Well, to start with, what is the total number in the steel industry, according to your estimation, which you attempted to organize?

Mr. FOSTER. That would be pretty hard to say, because there are so many independent companies. Do you refer just to the United States Steel Corporation?

Senator PHIPPS. I refer to the steel industry.

Mr. FOSTER. The United States Steel Corporation?

Senator PHIPPS. No; the steel industry as a whole.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not state. I would roughly state that there are 450,000 or 400,000, possibly 450,000, in this branch of the industry that are affected by the strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Of that number, whatever it may be—we will say 450,000 for round figures and for calculation—what percentage of that number are employees of the Steel Corporation's subsidiaries?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a pretty hard question for me to decide. My understanding is that they control about 50 per cent of the industry, possibly less if you want to extend the proposition and take in all of the independent companies.

Senator PHIPPS. And you think in round figures that something like 200,000 or 225,000 men of the Steel Corporation have been and are affected by this strike, and that perhaps 80 per cent of them are now out of employment?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do not think there would be 200,000 employees of the Steel Corporation that are in the departments that are affected by this strike. I have heard it stated that they have 50 per cent of the industry, but I do not think there are that many men in the mills of the United States Steel Corporation that are affected by the strike, including the office workers and officials.

Senator PHIPPS. As you are in charge of organizing this steel industry, I thought you would be better posted on those figures than I would be expected to be. Therefore I was trying to get that information from you.

Mr. FOSTER. I would state that in a number of towns it is practically impossible for our men to go in there and get any information at all. If we stop on the street we are arrested. If we speak to a worker we are arrested. I do not know how we are going to get the information. We can approximate it; that is all. We have got no access to the officials, or any way that we could get it definitely.

Senator PHIPPS. There is another point I want to ask you about: What has your experience been with the check-off system, which is included in the 12 demands?

Mr. FOSTER. If I understand that, that applies only to the mining end of the industry.

Senator PHIPPS. It is not so stated in the 12 demands. It is stated definitely as to the collection of dues of employees, members of the union, to be turned over to the union.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there are other demands here, although headed "General demands," that only apply in specific cases.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not want you to confuse that with the check-work system.

Mr. FOSTER. No; my understanding is that that is a stock demand, a regular demand, of the miners, and that it is in force in most of the districts where they operate.

Senator PHIPPS. I think you are confusing the two systems.

Mr. FOSTER. No; the check-off system.

Senator PHIPPS. One of the 12 demands, as I read it here, is the collection of the dues assessed upon them by the organization—

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). That is in effect among the miners.

Senator PHIPPS. Among the miners?

Mr. FOSTER. Among the miners; yes, sir. That is, as I understand it, that was not intended to apply to the rolling mills and the blast furnaces.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your experience in the matter of physical examination of workmen? Do you think that is necessary or do you class it as objectionable?



Mr. FOSTER. Well, I did not formulate those demands, of course. I could give you my opinion of it, that in many cases where I have seen it in effect it has been used to discriminate against the union workmen, men that apparently they could trump up no case against.

Senator PHIPPS. You have only been with the American Federation of Labor, I believe, for two or three years. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is not correct.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, in your present position.

Mr. FOSTER. As an organizer. I am not employed by the American Federation of Labor. I am employed by my own international union.

Senator PHIPPS. The reason for my question was to ascertain whether or not there had been a change in the attitude regarding physical examinations; whether or not the benefits to be derived by physical examinations by protecting other workingmen were greater than the objectionable features.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not make an argument on it.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not want to ask you to testify to anything you are not competent to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is—I do not think I would call it one of the fundamental demands, such as the rate and the others.

Senator STERLING. Just a word, Mr. Foster—suggested by Senator Phipps—in regard to the matter of the physical examination of the men and your suspicion that that was used for the purpose of excluding union men—

Mr. FOSTER. Not as a suspicion, but a positive knowledge.

Senator STERLING. A positive knowledge?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator STERLING. What proof have you of that—that they have had a man undergo a physical examination for the purpose of putting him to a test to give them an excuse for excluding him because he was a union man?

Mr. FOSTER. I never had any other than for them to tell me it has been done, and I know it where these practices are in effect, where this physical examination is in effect, that it is used for that purpose. I can even cite you proof positive if you want it.

Senator STERLING. Well, do you know of any man now who was physically fit and able to do the work of the mill who, on examination, was found physically unfit because he was a union man? Do you know of any such case?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have a case in mind.

Senator STERLING. Have you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. It is a chairman on the Soo Line in Chicago. He has got one eye and they have a rule there that men who are not physically fit should not be retained in the service. That is the substance of the rule, the exact wording I can not give; as far as this man was concerned, here was the effect it had. He was made to undergo a physical examination and he was pronounced unfit to work—he has got one eye—and the organization took the matter up. He is as competent a man in his line of work as there is in America. The organization took the matter up and fought the case through, and that man is still an employee of the Soo Line—no, I mean the Grand Trunk.

Senator STERLING. He is a railroad man?

Mr. FOSTER. He is.

Senator STERLING. He is not a steel worker at all?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of any such case among the steel workers?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not say that I do, but at the steel works the doctors are the same as everywhere.

Senator STERLING. But this is a steel matter——

Mr. FOSTER. But we are dealing with human beings only in our industries, and they are just the same.

Senator STERLING. Did you strike, then, and is that one of the grounds for the strike, that in some other industry, the railroads, for example, men had to undergo this examination for the purpose of furnishing an excuse for letting them out, because they were union men?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, as I stated, I do not consider it a very fundamental question. I do not think that there would be a strike over it.

Senator STERLING. You never really knew, did you, Mr. Foster, of any great injury or prejudice to a workman arising out of that practice in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think you could probably get more information on that subject from Mr. Tighe.

Senator STERLING. I am asking you if you yourself ever knew——

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). No; I do not work in the steel industry. If I did I daresay I could have gotten plenty of instances.

Senator STERLING. Do you know, in the union of which you are a member, the carmen, do you know whether that practice of physical examination has resulted in the jury or prejudice of the men employed in that industry?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not been handling that personally. We have other organizers who handle that.

Senator STERLING. But if there had been any great complaint in regard to it, you would have known that?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but, as I say, I do not think it is a fundamental proposition at all.

Senator STERLING. As a matter of fact, you have not heard very much complaint in regard to that practice among the carmen?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have.

Senator STERLING. Have you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have.

Senator STERLING. Can you cite us particular instances among the car workers?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I have not got anything very definite on it. I will say that, but——

Senator STERLING. Now, in answer to Senator Phipps, you said that this strike order called for a strike in all mills where the men were not working under union agreements. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Then, of course, the strike was ordered, so far as the other works were concerned, without regard to the conditions of labor, of the pay received, or the hours per day of labor, and had no reference to the conditions prevailing in any particular plant or industry?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. They had not——

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). The strike itself arose from a refusal of a conference from the different corporations.

Senator STERLING. Yes; that is what you said. I understand it. But the strike was ordered after it arose, in all mills where the men were not working under union agreements?

Mr. FOSTER. Because we knew in all those mills there was no system of collective bargaining in operation and our first demand, the fundamental demand, of the whole system of demands is the right of collective bargaining and that is what precipitated it.

Senator STERLING. And there was no collective bargaining in these mills when the strike was called. The strike was called without regard to the conditions of the men, without regard to their pay and the conditions under which they worked; was it not?

Mr. FOSTER. These men wanted to present their grievances. Some men had some grievances and others had others; and they were denied the opportunity to present their grievances, and the strike was called.

Senator STERLING. And, as to particular grievances in these particular industries, you did not know as to that, but the strike was general and the call for the strike was in all plants where the labor was not organized?

Mr. FOSTER. These men presented grievances, bushels of them.

Senator STERLING. How many?

Mr. FOSTER. Why, they were sent in. Their delegates presented them.

The CHAIRMAN. What were some of them?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, they wanted more money. Men had been discharged and they wanted them reinstated, and they wanted the eight-hour day and overtime rates and generally better conditions.

Senator STERLING. Was an increase in wages a part of the 12 demands?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you specify in your demands how much of an increase you wanted?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. You wanted a conference over that, did you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; we figured that was a matter to be worked out in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the long hours of service one of the particular things you had complaints about?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the long-hour day in the steel industry is one of the great drawbacks to the work as far as the vast majority of the men are concerned.

Senator PHIPPS. You know that you have the basic eight-hour day, of course, don't you?

Mr. FOSTER. In some of the plants, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Don't you know when the order for the basic eight-hour day was made and put into effect in the steel mills?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I know it was put into effect to stop the organization of the employees.

Senator STERLING. And that is why you complain of it?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I do not complain of it. It is a step in advance over the straight eight-hour day, but it is not what the workers in

the steel plants want. The workers in the steel plants want the actual eight-hour day, not the basing eight-hour day.

Senator PHIPPS. But the men would work if they got pay and a half for the overtime more than the eight hours, and frequently desire to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. They can not quit at the end of the eight hours anyway in the steel mills. If a man should quit at the end of eight hours he would be discharged.

Senator STERLING. Are you sure that is the general rule? Do you know that from your own knowledge?

Mr. FOSTER. I am so informed by the steel workers.

Senator STERLING. That the men are required to work continuously twelve hours per day in spite of the eight-hour-day order?

Mr. FOSTER. I am so informed; yes, sir. Of course, I do not mean to say that a man can not lay off a day or so if he has to, but, so far as the twelve-hour day is concerned, it is a twelve-hour proposition, and it is not up to the individuals or the crews to quit at the end of eight hours, but the shift works eight hours.

Senator STERLING. Your attention was called to one book, The Syndicalist, written, I believe, in 1911, or later—later, I see, according to the evidence shown by the book itself—and to which your attention was called, as late as 1913. When did you write the book Trade Unionism the Road to Freedom.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not say; I think it was about four years ago.

Senator STERLING. Was that written after The Syndicalist was written?

Mr. FOSTER. Afterwards.

Senator STERLING. How long afterwards?

Mr. FOSTER. About three or four years afterwards.

Senator STERLING. Then Trade Unionism the Road to Freedom is a comparatively late book?

Mr. FOSTER. As compared with the other.

Senator STERLING. I call your attention to two or three extracts from Trade Unionism. On page 24 you speak as follows:

Under the new order as pictured above, Government, such as we know it, would gradually disappear. In an era of science and justice, this makeshift institution, having lost its usefulness, would shrivel and die.

Now, that was written two or three years ago, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. Not two or three, but three or four.

Senator STERLING. Three or four years ago. Do you still entertain that belief concerning Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have my own ideas about the functions of Government, of course.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I would take that position now, though. I think I would take the same position on it, if my personal opinions are germane here at all, that Lester F. Ward takes.

Senator STERLING. That what?

Mr. FOSTER. That Lester F. Ward takes.

Senator STERLING. Well, I am not familiar with Lester F. Ward's opinions, but does he believe in doing away with government by peaceful revolution or otherwise?

Mr. FOSTER. Lester F. Ward in my estimation, and in the estimation of many others, was one of the greatest minds that America

ever produced and he is honored wherever science is known in this country.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And Lester F. Ward states the opinion that government, that is, in many of its forms, is developing into a system of commissions.

Senator STERLING. Who is Lester F. Ward?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he was employed by the United States Government in some of its work. He was a sociologist—

Senator STERLING. And socialist?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. A sociologist and not a socialist?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir. He was the greatest writer on economics that this hemisphere ever produced, and I recommend that you read him.

Senator STERLING. According to your judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. No; not according to my judgment, but according to the judgment of many students.

Senator STERLING. I call attention to another paragraph in this book written three or four years ago according to your statement:

The industries now in the hands of National, State, and municipal government, would be given over completely into the care of the workers engaged in them. Unlike in our days of graft, these workers would then have every reason to give the public the best possible service.

Do you believe in that doctrine now, that the industries now in the hands of National, State, and municipal government should be given over completely into the care of the workers engaged in them?

Mr. FOSTER. That does not seem to be a very startling proposition nowadays.

Senator STERLING. It does not?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I would state it in just exactly the same terms, but I believe that the men in the industries as far as possible should be given a right to operate those industries.

Senator STERLING. That is syndicalism, is it not, or one form of syndicalism?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not consider it so at all.

Senator STERLING. Have you not given utterance to practically the same thing, perhaps making a little more extreme statement, in your book called "Syndicalism"? I read a quotation at the end of this book by Emile Pouget—I do not know that I have pronounced his name correctly—as follows:

Besides its program of incessant skirmishes, the trade-union is engaged in the work of integral emancipation, of which it will be the efficacious agent. Its fundamental task is to take possession of the social wealth now in the hands of the bourgeois class, and to reorganize society on a communist basis, so that with a minimum of productive effort the maximum of well being will be obtained.

Do you indorse the sentiment and the principle stated there?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I would not state it that way now. I would much rather stand by the quotation in the previous paragraph.

Senator STERLING. You quoted this extract I was reading with approval at the time, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And as illustrative of the principles for which you stood in trade unionism and in syndicalism, too?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, a quotation is not—anything I write myself—

Senator STERLING. A man advocating a certain cause would not put as a final thing in the book he wrote advocating that cause something contradictory to his opinions as expressed in that book?

Mr. FOSTER. That is true enough.

Senator STERLING. I want to call your attention to another thing. Do you remember the date of your last communication with Solidarity, the I. W. W. organ?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, about eight or nine years ago.

Senator STERLING. Do you remember a letter that you wrote on November 4, 1914, to them?

Mr. FOSTER. What was it about?

Mr. STERLING. Well, it was about the organization of the steel workers and about the I. W. W. I will read an extract from it:

I am satisfied from my observation that the only way for the I. W. W. to have the workers adopt and practice the principles of revolutionary unionism—which I take is its mission—is to give up the attempt to create a new labor movement, turn itself into a propaganda league, get into the organized labor movement, and by building up better fighting machines within the old unions than those possessed by our reactionary enemies revolutionize these unions, even as our French syndicalist fellow workers have so successfully done with theirs.

This letter was signed by “Yours, for revolution, William Z. Foster.”

That was an expression of your sentiments at that time, I suppose?

Mr. FOSTER. It was. I try to be honest at all times.

Senator STERLING. In those days, when you wrote syndicalism and prayed unionism, and wrote this letter, you believed in the doctrines of syndicalism, and you believed also in the doctrine of direct action, did you not, on the part of the workers?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Senator STERLING. And that direct action meant that you might accomplish your purpose by peaceful means if you could reasonably well, and by violence if you could not accomplish them by peaceful means?

Mr. FOSTER. I wrote the book as it stands.

Senator McKELLAR. Bearing on this very subject, I want to call your attention to certain other extracts from your book on syndicalism and ask you whether you now believe in them.

On page 13, under the title “Bloodshed,” is the following:

Another favorite objection of ultralegal and peaceful Socialists is that the general strike would cause bloodshed.

This is probably true, as every great strike is accompanied by violence. Every forward pace humanity has taken has been gained at the cost of untold sufferings and loss of life, and the accomplishment of the revolution will probably be no exception, but the prospect of bloodshed does not frighten the syndicalist worker, as it does the parlor Socialist. He is too much accustomed to risking himself in the murderous industries and on the hellish battle fields, in the niggardly service of his masters, to set much value on his life. He will gladly risk it once, if necessary, in his own behalf. He has no sentimental regards for what may happen to his enemies during the general strike. He leaves them to worry over that detail.

The syndicalist knows that the general strike will be a success, and the timid fears of his opponents will never turn him from it, any more than will their arguments that it is "illegal," "unfair," and "uncivilized" weapon.

You believe in those views at that time, and you still believe in them?

Mr. FOSTER. I did at that time; yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you still believe in them, or have you changed your views on that subject?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir—

Senator McKELLAR. I want to now call your attention, on page 14, of this book, under the headline "The Scab":

A large portion of the syndicalists' success in their strikes is due to their energetic treatment of the strike breaker. According to syndicalists' ethics, a poverty-stricken working man, in his predicament, can do nothing save scab. He may beg, borrow, steal, starve, or commit suicide, and still retain the friendship and esteem of his fellow workers; but let him take the place of a striker and he immediately outlaws himself. He becomes so much vermin to be ruthlessly exterminated.

Have you changed your views on that subject?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I would never state that. I do not admire a scab.

Senator McKELLAR. I did not ask you that. We are not discussing that subject. I am asking you if you still adhere to that doctrine or if you have changed your views about it?

Mr. FOSTER. I stated that it was not my intention to express my personal opinion, if I could avoid it, but I believe a workingman can do anything but scab. I think that is the lowest act of his life.

Senator McKELLAR. You think a scab should be, to use your words here, ruthlessly exterminated as so much vermin?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe we can exterminate them.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you believe they ought to be killed, the scabs?

Mr. FOSTER. I wouldn't go that far, probably.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you mean by "ruthlessly exterminate"? That is a right serious question, Mr. Foster, and I want to say to you before you answer it—

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that, but it seems to me a proposition like that ought to kind of stand on its face. You do not think for a minute that I would write there that people should be murdered?

Senator McKELLAR. What do you call exterminating as so much vermin? To exterminate vermin you kill them, and if you exterminate scabs you are obliged to kill them.

Mr. FOSTER. I wouldn't understand it that way at all.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you understand by it? What would you do to them?

Mr. FOSTER. There are various ways of exterminating them.

Senator McKELLAR. How would you go about it? Would you do it quietly, by poison, or what other way would you suggest to exterminate them?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the principal weapon, of course, is education. There is no question about that.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, but you can not exterminate anything by education?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, you can. You can exterminate the scab.

Senator McKELLAR. With education?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. That is your method, and that is what you believe in?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not believe in killing or stoning?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I wouldn't think of killing them. I never killed one in my life.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you ever hurt anybody in your life?

Senator McKELLAR. Now, I want to call your attention to this:

The syndicalist is a race suicider. He knows that children are a detriment to him in his daily struggle—

Do you still adhere to that doctrine? Do you believe in race suicide?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I don't know that I would use those terms.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, do you believe in it substantially?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say this: That I know the American people are consciously placing limitations on their families.

Senator McKELLAR. If that is so, the question is what do you believe about it? Do you believe it is right?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, you can not indict a whole people. They are practically all doing it.

Senator McKELLAR. In this book you say you believe it should be done and you give the reasons. Do you still adhere to that doctrine?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is foolishness on the part of the workman to undertake to raise a large family on the wages that are paid.

Senator McKELLAR. That answers the question.

I now call your attention to page 18 of your book on Syndicalism, where you say:

The syndicalist is as unscrupulous in his choice of weapons to fight his every day battles as for his final struggle with capitalism. He allows no consideration of "legality," "religion," "patriotism," "honor," "duty," etc., to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics. The only sentiment he knows is loyalty to the interests of the working class. He is in utter revolt against capitalism in all its phases. His lawless course often lands him in jail, but he is so fired by revolutionary enthusiasm that jails, or even death, have no terrors for him. He glories in martyrdom, consoling himself with the knowledge that he is a terror to his enemies, and that his movement, to-day sending chills along the spines of internationalism—capitalism—to-morrow will put an end to this monstrosity.

Is that your belief now?

Mr. FOSTER. I just want to say this about that. Of course, I can repeat what I have already said before, but if you will put them all in quotation marks, I will say yes; that stands.

Senator McKELLAR. You will say what?

Mr. FOSTER. If you put all those terms in quotation marks, that stands.

Senator McKELLAR. You say you still believe in that?

Mr. FOSTER. If they are put in quotation marks, I say yes.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, you still believe it is your duty to allow no considerations of legality, religion, patriotism, honor, or duty to stand in the way of your adoption of effective tactics to secure your ends, and to that you answer yes?

Mr. FOSTER. I just say this much, at the risk of being misquoted and misunderstood, that all of those terms are relative terms—

Senator McKELLAR. I don't agree with you about that. I think they are terms of the highest importance.



Mr. FOSTER. In the Pittsburgh papers at the present time they are considering it patriotism to act as scabs. Now I can have nothing to do with that kind of patriotism. I give it no consideration whatever.

Senator McKELLAR. We are not talking about what is considered patriotism in the Pittsburgh newspapers. What I am talking about is, do you still subscribe to the doctrine announced on page 18 of your book, which I have read to you, in which you say that being a syndicalist he allows no consideration of legality, religion, patriotism, honor, duty, and so forth, to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics.

Mr. FOSTER. I have answered perfectly plainly and distinctly that if you put those in quotation marks, I say yes.

Senator McKELLAR. You still stand by that. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean when you say "put them in quotation marks"?

Mr. FOSTER. What I mean by that is, that that is a conception of some one else's conception of those particular things.

Senator McKELLAR. I now call your attention to another very interesting statement found on page 39 of this book, under the head "Labor fakers":

The American labor movement is infested with hordes of dishonest officials, who misuse the powers conferred upon them to exploit the labor movement to their own advantage, even though this involves the betrayal of the interests of the workers. The exploits of these labor fakers are too well known to need recapitulation here. Suffice to say the labor faker must go.

To whom were you referring as labor fakers at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, unfortunately, I was of the opinion of a good many men that men who did not happen to agree with my particular philosophy had some ulterior motive, but I want to say, as the result of a number of years' experience, that I think that the degree of integrity and honesty is high among the officials of these various organizations. There is no institution in the world but what has its crooks in it. I think that for disinterestedness, unselfishness, and honesty the leaders and officials of this union movement will compare favorably with those of any other institution in the United States, bar none.

Senator McKELLAR. Then you were wholly mistaken in your criticisms of the organized-labor movement in this country when you wrote that paragraph, were you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; when I said there were hordes of them. I do not believe there are; but there are dishonest men in the labor movement the same as there are in every other institution, and I say that they should go.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you referring to any particular one, may I ask?

Mr. FOSTER. No; not any particular one.

Senator McKELLAR. You were just referring generally; and, as a matter of justice and right, you think you were in error when you made that reference?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You signed this book, "W. Z. Foster, secretary of S. L. of N. A., 1000 South Paulina Street, Chicago." Who are the officers of the syndicalist league of North America?

Mr. FOSTER. We did not have any officers to speak of.

Senator McKELLAR. Why did you sign your name as secretary of an organization that did not exist?

Mr. FOSTER. It was just a very loose collection of groups.

Senator McKELLAR. A collection of groups?

Mr. FOSTER. Of groups of men.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there anybody of prominence connected with it besides yourself?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Were they connected in any way with the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. In no way.

Senator STERLING. Is any nonunion man who gets a place made vacant by a striker a scab under your rules?

Mr. FOSTER. Any nonunion man that takes the place——

Senator STERLING. That takes the place made vacant by a striker, a scab?

Mr. FOSTER. Not only a nonunion man but any union man who does it is a scab—a strike breaker.

Senator STERLING. Yes. Then, however much he may need work, and sees a chance for employment whereby he can earn money to support himself and family, he is called a scab because he takes that job and is visited with the condemnation of the union men and union leaders. That is right, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the presumption is that the man who quit that job endeavoring to better his condition needs it about as bad as anyone does, and that as far as workingmen are concerned, workingmen of principle, there is no job there to be had, and he has no right to step in there and take advantage of the other man's stand in an effort to better his conditions, to take his job away from him. That is what it really amounts to.

Senator STERLING. It would be more honorable for him to let his family starve than to take that job made vacant by a striker?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I don't think that in this country the situation is so bad that a man is faced with the alternative of either being a scab or letting his family starve. I do not think we are up against that yet.

Senator STERLING. Have you not known cases, almost of that kind, about mills, where men were out of employment, and there were non-union men who sought the places simply as a matter of necessity, places made vacant by strikers?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think anyone would go to work in a mill unless it was a matter of necessity.

Senator STERLING. You do not?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is a case of necessity, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been a good deal asked you about the I. W. W. question and your change of views; back in 1911, when you were a delegate to the Budapest convention—was it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were an avowed I. W. W. then?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you were writing articles for Solidarity, which was the I. W. W. organ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time Mr. Gompers was engaged in—I don't know that I would say a movement, but Mr. Gompers was denouncing the activities of the I. W. W., was he not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And in an article in *Solidarity* of July 30, 1910, there is a scathing denunciation of the I. W. W. by Mr. Gompers. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not say I am.

The CHAIRMAN. But at that time, when you were advocating the doctrines of the I. W. W. through the country and abroad, you were running counter to the policies of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gompers, however, has not changed his views concerning the I. W. W., but your views have changed?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think Mr. Gompers's views have changed—only to become more pronounced, possibly.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say now to the committee that your views have so changed that you are in harmony with the views of Mr. Gompers?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir. I don't know that it is 100 per cent, but in the main they are.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been asked about different writings. You must have realized the truth of the old saying, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book." You seem to have written two—too many. You wrote the *Solidarity*, and I have a copy here, dated April 22, 1911, as follows: "Observations in Germany." That is the heading of the article. You say:

Beer plays a large part in the German revolutionary movement, even as wine does in that part of France where the "bunch" say it is a physical impossibility for a man to be a revolutionist and an abstainer at the same time.

Yours for the I. W. W.,

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

Is that one of your productions?

Mr. FOSTER. I kind of have a faint recollection of writing something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it would be difficult for a prohibitionist to be a revolutionist?

Mr. FOSTER. I have kind of changed my mind on that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not indorse this article I have read, then?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, according to what I have heard since Russia went dry, there were some important events over there.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you mean by "Yours for the I. W. W."; did that have any significance?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I was just for it, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, March 25, in *Solidarity*, I read this:

As for the I. W. W., the American syndicalist organization—its militants, who are imbued with the real syndicalist theories, will do their best to prevent the S. P.—

What is the "S. P."?

Mr. FOSTER. The Socialist Party.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

From protecting or preparing the ground for their organization. They will insist on a policy of strict official neutrality toward all political parties, and,

as individuals, they will vigorously combat the political-action theory being advocated by the S. P. or by any other party.

Yours for the revolution,

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

What did you mean by "Yours for the revolution"? What revolution had you in mind?

Mr. FOSTER. Just what I have stated in my writings.

The CHAIRMAN. The social revolution?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You said awhile ago that since prohibition had been enacted in Russia important events had happened there. Are you in sympathy with the Bolshevistic movement in Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know much about it.

Senator McKELLAR. Then you do not believe in it?

Mr. FOSTER. Not knowing about it, of course I can not say that I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you in any of these articles in Solidarity recommend sabotage?

Mr. FOSTER. I probably did.

The CHAIRMAN. And believed in that at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you changed your mind in regard to that too?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is part of the general conception; these things are all linked together.

Senator McKELLAR. And all spelled violence when you believed in them?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it spelled a fight.

Senator McKELLAR. And violence.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you a delegate to the sixth annual I. W. W. convention?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know whether it was the sixth or the fifth. I was to one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that held?

Mr. FOSTER. 1911, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. In spite of all these opinions that have been brought out, these opinions in your writings, and others that probably could be brought out, you say now that your views have changed and that you are operating as to this strike under the directions of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Not under the direction. We are very careful about that in the labor movement. Under the direction of 24 international unions, and with the indorsement of the Federation?

The CHAIRMAN. You are not antagonistic to the Federation?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; the Federation has indorsed the activities of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you explain to the committee why it was the strike could not be postponed at the request of the President? I have forgotten whether you did or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not; but I can.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you do that?

Mr. FOSTER. The reason for that was this—well, there were a whole group of reasons in fact. The principal reason, I think, was that the companies were carrying on a policy of wholesale discharge of our men. The men, of course, wanted better conditions, they felt that their organizations had been in existence long enough to insist upon better conditions, and we were informed that the bosses in the steel mills, not in one place only, but in many places, circulated stories that the American Federation of Labor was in here just simply to rob the workers and to carry them along to a certain point, get the money from them, and then leave them in the lurch, and that if this strike was postponed it meant the abandonment of the effort and the steel workers would be left to themselves. I know that as far as the committee was concerned the postponing of the strike order would not have prevented the strike, because practically every district working in this movement had served notice on the committee that they were going to strike whether the committee postponed it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men do you say are out on the strike now in the steel mills?

Mr. FOSTER. According to the best information I can get, Mr. Tighe submitted a list of some 362,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be in the United States Steel?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the United States Steel and the independent.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us how many of those men are what have been termed "foreigners" here?

Mr. FOSTER. A large percentage of them.

The CHAIRMAN. When we use the term "foreigner" we use it as representing those who do not speak the English language—perhaps not a good definition.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand it that way myself. I understand a foreigner is a man born in a foreign country.

The CHAIRMAN. And whether or not he is naturalized?

Mr. FOSTER. Whether or not he is naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. Using the term that way then, tell us about what percentage are foreigners.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large percentage, naturally, because there is a large percentage in the mills, and we, in our organizations, probably have a slightly larger percentage even in the mills; that is, in those district that have not struck, 100 per cent. That is for this very good reason. When our organizers come into a district they make a general appeal to all of them to organize and the first man to respond is the man who needs organization most, that is the unskilled worker. That is our experience in the campaign and the unskilled worker is to a very large extent a foreigner. Then as the organization progresses the skilled man stands in the background and watches what is going on. He has seen many strikes in the steel industry and he has seen them all go to smash, and he stands in the background and watches what is going on and pretty soon as the organization extends from department to department he begins to take heart a little bit and he affiliates himself with it, and finally when an organization is reasonably well established it usually develops a sort of an avalanche of the skilled workers coming in, and then they usually complete themselves 100 per cent while the unskilled are still in only a partially organized condition.

I want to say this: There have been statements made here that Americans were not asked to join the organization or not asked to strike. That is absolutely not the truth. Every piece of literature that has been gotten out in the whole course of this campaign has been in English; possibly we sometimes used one language in addition; sometimes as many as six languages in addition, but I do not know of a single piece of literature that was gotten out in this campaign that did not have English.

The CHAIRMAN. The literature you got out?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But do you have to publish it in six languages?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; in order that these men can read.

The CHAIRMAN. What are those languages?

Mr. FOSTER. We vary them from time to time according to the mills. They are English, Polish, Slavish, Croatian, Italian, and now and then Lithuanian, Magyar, and Hungarian.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Russian?

Mr. FOSTER. Never Russian. I do not believe we have ever had a piece of literature in Russian.

The CHAIRMAN. While this strike has been going on, have you been in communication in any way with the I. W. W. leaders?

Mr. FOSTER. Not a bit.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vincent St. John?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not seen him at all?

Mr. FOSTER. I saw him; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his position with the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that he has got any position. I could not say.

The CHAIRMAN. He was formerly secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. He was an official in the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen him while the strike was on?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever talked about the strike with him?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the information of the committee that a great issue has been made of this foreign question. There has been a systematic attempt to create a race situation in Pennsylvania and it is being done by the steel corporations there. They have raised the question of the foreigner, and all these ramifications about the Americans that were not asked to strike and not asked to join the unions was just so much of that propaganda.

The fact of the matter is this, that we have got many organizers in the field, and if you will ask Mr. Tighe how many foreign-speaking organizers he has got, I doubt if he will be able to say that he has got one.

Mr. TIGHE. No; we have not got a single foreign speaker on our list.

Mr. FOSTER. Not one man that can speak a foreign language; and I do not know of any other international union in this campaign, except the United Mine Workers and the Mine, Mill and Smelting Workers, that have any foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. Men are joining, are they not, that do not speak the English language?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you get to them?

Mr. FOSTER. In this way: They all speak a little bit, all understand a little bit, and they urge for organization—the conditions in the plants are so bad from their standpoint that you do not have to persuade them very much; in fact, they demand organization. And I want to say this further: We have local secretaries in all these localities, local secretaries in all these steel centers, and in Homestead we have Dick Riley, in Braddock is Gent—they are both Irish—in McKeesport we have Murphy, and in Clareton we have Patrick Henry Brogan.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they Irish?

Mr. FOSTER. All Irish, every one of them. So far as I know, we have not got one foreigner anywhere as a secretary. We have made our special appeal to the Americans in this campaign, because we know they occupy the skilled positions and are the strategic men in the industry.

Senator WALSH. When you say they are Irish, you mean of Irish blood?

Mr. FOSTER. Irish descent.

Senator WALSH. They are Americans, are they not?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course.

Senator WALSH. And none of them are Socialists, are they, if they are Irish, or I. W. W. men?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know of any. I will say this, in the selection of those men I have never appointed one, not one. If we are going to put a secretary in at Stubenville, or Wheeling, we take it up with the local central body there and ask them to pick out the best man they have got, and they give us a man.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you said anything about the meetings, the restraint of free speech? Have you touched upon that at all?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything that has taken place in the way of alleged intimidations there?

Mr. FOSTER. There are certain mills in the Pittsburgh district that are not down 100 per cent—the Duquesne mill and the McKeesport mill. There are some of the others there that are not 100 per cent struck, like Homestead, which is probably 80 per cent, and the only reason those men are not out 100 per cent to-day in protest is simply because they have been and are being denied their rights of free speech and free assembly.

The CHAIRMAN. Some complaint was made about the State constabulary there. Have you had any complaint about them?

Mr. FOSTER. The State constabulary have performed the part of trouble makers pure and simple in that district, and I feel convinced in my own mind that if this committee had not gone into sitting there would have been many men murdered in the steel districts in Pennsylvania, due to the activities of these "Cossacks." But since this committee has been in session they have modified their conduct a great deal, due to the fact that the attention of the committee is being called to their activities there.

In localities where we have been allowed to hold our meetings there has never been a semblance of disturbance of any kind. Our meetings have been peaceable and orderly. A couple of nights ago

we had a meeting in the Pittsburgh district of ten to fifteen thousand strikers and it was perfectly orderly, not a ripple of excitement or disturbance of any sort. The day before the strike in Braddock and Rankin the burgess and the chief of police in both places said: "After listening to what your organizers have said we have got nothing to say except to repeat what they say. Just follow the advice of these men and there will be no trouble in Braddock or Rankin." And there was no trouble in any of these cases until they brought on this State constabulary and the others, I might call them outside disturbers, or agitators, to start the trouble.

Senator PHIPPS. During your campaign of organizing, how did the work progress? Can you give us approximately the number of men that were organized, say, on the 1st of June last?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very difficult question, for this reason: That all the men do not come into our committee. We sign up some at our mass meetings, and then the local unions are holding meetings all the time, and there is a constant stream of men coming in, and it is very hard to tell.

Senator PHIPPS. Haven't you some system of monthly reports to know what these men are doing in the way of enrolling members?

Mr. FOSTER. From our secretaries, yes, but not from other organizers. That is their own business.

Senator PHIPPS. Was it a gradual or a rapid increase in the number that were enrolled from month to month?

Mr. FOSTER. It varied from time to time, and when we started they just streamed in, and then they gave them the eight-hour day and the war came to an end and the winter came on and the flu came on and the industry shut down, and that checked the organization for a time, but afterwards when it began to recover a little they began to stream into the organization by the thousands.

Senator PHIPPS. Up to the 1st of June of this year, say, what was your percentage of workmen at that time who had joined the unions?

Mr. FOSTER. I think up to the 1st of June we could safely say there were 100,000 men signed up.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you recall what the figures were say 60 days later, August 1?

Mr. FOSTER. That is pretty hard to say, although lots and lots of men joined during that period.

Senator PHIPPS. They were still joining, you say, during that 60 days?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. And since the strike they have joined by the thousands.

Senator PHIPPS. And did that continue during the month of August?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. In some localities it has come to a standstill, but in others they would stream in.

Senator PHIPPS. In the face of that, the committee is hardly able to understand what you feared when you were called upon and requested to defer the date of the strike call until after October 6, when this meeting in Washington is to be held.

Mr. FOSTER. What we feared—we did not fear it; we knew that it was going to happen—was a wild, unorganized outbreak in the steel industry that would lead—nobody knew where—that would



destroy the organizations in there, so far as the American Federation of Labor was concerned; and in a situation like that, there was nothing else to do but to go ahead and try to retain some kind of control and order in the situation.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, after all is said and done, does it not appear to be the fact that the basis of this trouble is unionism or nonunionism, demand for recognition of the union?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What in your judgment is at the bottom of this dispute if it is not unionism?

Mr. FOSTER. At the bottom of this dispute is poor conditions in the steel industry, and the only way to right them is through the process of collective bargaining, and this fight is precipitated by a refusal to establish a system of collective bargaining whereby the men can take up and settle their grievances.

Senator PHIPPS. You have stated that you have not been in a position personally to know the conditions in the mills, the working conditions or the living conditions. You are telling us, then, what you have said, based on the information that has come to you as secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. I know something of the living conditions of the men.

Senator PHIPPS. Are they worse than they were five years or ten years ago, or are they better?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that they are worse. I can not speak of five or ten years ago. I know that at the present time every steel town in America that I have come in contact with is a disgrace to America, positively a disgrace.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, I think we are through, and we are very much obliged to you. Mr. Gompers wants to be heard for 10 minutes. Before you proceed, Mr. Gompers, there are three witnesses here. Are those witnesses here now, and can we give them five minutes apiece?

Senator MCKELLAR. Bring them back to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. At 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Gompers says he can get through in 10 minutes.

#### STATEMENT OF SAMUEL GOMPERS—Resumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Gompers. We will be glad to hear from you now or in the morning; just as you please.

Mr. GOMPERS. I know this rather an imposition to ask the Senators to remain in session at this late hour.

The CHAIRMAN. We have no eight-hour day at all.

Mr. GOMPERS. Me too. There are a few matters that I want to bring to the attention of the committee. I am not averse to being questioned during my statement—sometimes it is best—but if I can have 10 minutes in continuous presentation of the matter, I think I can help in facilitating the statements I want to make in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, and the committee will not interfere with you.

Mr. GOMPERS. I shall be very glad to answer any questions which any members of the committee desire to ask me; that is, I shall try to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN. At the end of the 10 minutes.

Mr. GOMPERS. At the end of the 10 minutes; yes. In explaining what is regarded as a small or a comparatively small vote of those who were asked to vote as to the strike, this should be known, that in nearly every organization—that is, in nearly every trade union—there is a provision that new members—that is, men whose membership is not three months or over—shall not be permitted to vote upon a strike. That provision is made with a view that the members of the organization who have had some experience and who are not governed purely by enthusiasm or impetuosity, shall not be swamped by an element which may rush into an organization for a few weeks or months and then decide upon a policy of striking and probably abandon the organization, the union and their fellow workers to their own fate. As a matter of fact, that provision is intended for the stabilization of unionism rather than the opposite, as it has been stated before this committee, the campaign of organization had gone on for about a year and a half before the strike began.

In the first few weeks or months the results were nil, or almost so, except those who had pleaded with the organization and our organizers to come and organize the workers in the steel industry. Then it grew and gained impetus as time went on. When there was anything definite held up to the men that their needs would be looked into and helped, they came in in great numbers. My information is, although it is purely by reports and hearsay, that from June, when the membership was 100,000, to August, it increased 50,000. So much for that.

Some years ago I was given information which at that time seemed to me to be authentic, and has never yet been denied, that in the earlier days of the United States Steel Corporation the executive board of that time had adopted a motion and communicated it to all the associate and subsidiary companies. It is a brief motion, and I would like to read it.

Senator McKELLAR. What motion was that, Mr. Gompers?

Mr. GOMPERS. It will be read. My secretary will read it.

Mr. ROBERTS [reading]:

That we are unalterably opposed to any expansion of union labor, and advise subsidiary companies to take a firm position when these questions come up, and say that they are not going to recognize it; that is, any extension of the unions in mills where they do not now exist; that great care should be used to prevent trouble and that they promptly report and confer with the corporation.

Senator McKELLAR. What date was that?

Mr. GOMPERS. June 17, 1901. That has been published several times since, and has never been, so far as my knowledge extends, denied.

Mr. TIGHE. I think that is correct, Mr. Gompers.

Mr. GOMPERS. In 1911 the United States Steel Corporation, through its executive committee or its finance committee, I do not know which, was evidently hurt by a publication or an article which appeared in the American Magazine. Either the finance committee or the executive committee adopted a motion that five of its stockholders should be appointed to make an investigation and a report

upon the charges or insinuations which were contained in that article. The article was, I think, under the caption, "Old age at 40." The corporation adopted that motion and appointed a committee of its stockholders, as follows: Thomas DeWitt Tyler, of Philadelphia; Stuyvesant Fish, of New York; Darius Miller, of New York; Charles A. Painter, of Pittsburgh; and Charles L. Taylor, of Pittsburgh.

That committee made its investigation and its report. I hold a copy of that report in my hands. I desire, if I may, to read to you that part of the committee's report to the finance committee. It is under date of New York, N. Y., April 15, 1912, and addressed to Hon. E. H. Gary, chairman United States Steel Corporation, New York, N. Y. The whole of that section of the report under the caption, "The repression of the men," is what I want to read. It is not more than 20 lines.

Mr. ROBERTS [reading]:

The Steel Corporation has made efficiency the one standard by which continuance of employment in its plants is determined. If we are to understand the term "repression of workmen" as a criticism of and objection to this defined policy, then the implied charge is true. If, on the other hand, it involves the question as to what measures the officers of the corporation should adopt for the suppression of organizations that in the past have, at times, proved irresponsible and incapable of self-control, that have advocated and oftentimes insisted upon what are believed by many to be fallacious theories and practices, then, at least, the charge may well be open to discussion.

As a committee of stockholders, we do not believe the final solution of the problems involved in this question has been reached. We do believe the present methods are preferable to the old for all concerned, and that the Steel Corporation, in view of the practices often pursued by labor organizations in steel mills in past years, is justified in the position it has taken.

Mr. GOMPERS. I offer that, if it may go in.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you the action of the corporation taken pursuant to that report?

Mr. GOMPERS. No, sir; I have not. I have the report. The question of the closed and the open shop has been mooted and discussed before this committee and elsewhere. I may just say a word about it and submit a matter which I had written upon the subject of which I would like to have your consideration. I do not ask you to give time for its reading, but I do hope that some time you will have an opportunity of reading it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it in form now to be put into the record?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir; this small one.

The CHAIRMAN. You might read it.

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir; the longer one I want to put into the record.

Mr. ROBERTS (reading).

The American Federation of Labor History Encyclopedia and Reference Book, the official publication of the American Federation of Labor gives this definition of "closed shop":

"Organized labor insists upon the 'union shop,' not the 'closed shop,' as charged by the employers. The 'closed shop' is where the doors are closed to union men. The 'open shop' is where the principle of collective bargaining is denied, otherwise a 'nonunion' or a 'scab shop.'"

Mr. GOMPERS. There is a much better definition of that in an editorial which I wrote for the American Federationist some time ago, under the caption "No shop is closed," and I ask that it may be incorporated.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Let it go in.  
(The article referred to is as follows:)

The phrase "closed shop" is of recent use. It was coined, and is employed on all occasions, by the enemies of trade unionism for a purpose. That purpose is to divert attention from the defensive action of union members, if preserving their union, to what is no more than an incidental consequence of that action.

The union creates certain desirable labor conditions. The nonunionists try to destroy them. By not competing with one another for the employment, the unionists make their advantage. By competing, the nonunionists would leave the dictation of terms wholly to employers. That is the merest A B C of this feature in the case of labor. And then the employers, when the union has gained something through its advantage, come forward, with a demand for "the open shop" and make an appeal to the public in the name of liberty. To all the inhabitants of Easy Street—who complacently regard themselves as "the general public"—this slogan of the employing class sounds justified as "truly American."

Trade unions are open. Nearly all are wide open to any man or woman qualified at the occupation organized, at an entrance fee barely sufficient to equalize the payments of the union's cash benevolent benefits and current costs of administration. Hardly any union ever asks a nonunionist to pay for the slightest percentage of the damage he has done as a disruptionist. It is literally and positively true, without evasion or equivocation, that trade-unions, and consequently union shops, are open for all wage-workers whom any employer would possibly contemplate as employees, to be kept regularly and permanently in his hire.

We beg, then, that the press, the public-spirited men and women who declare themselves in favor of labor in times of disputes, and any other class of persons who deem themselves interested, will accept the fact that what trade unionists call for is the "union" shop. When confronted by persons who persist in speaking, in private and public, of the "closed shop," the trade-unionists recognize by that sign that they are dealing with an enemy, employing the verbal ammunition of an enemy, distorting facts as an enemy, and without having the manliness and candor of a courageous enemy.

Mr. GOMPERS. In connection with two activities of the United States Steel Corporation, I should like to submit a thought, or a thought upon each of them. One is in regard to their pensions, their old-age pensions.

For convenience I have taken as a comparison or a basis for comparison the International Typographical Union, and the membership and the amounts paid by the Steel Corporation, and by the International Typographical Union for just that benefit, for just that gratuity. I think you will find it interesting. I offer that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Senator PHIPPS. How are those funds raised for the Typographical Union out of which they pay benefits?

Mr. GOMPERS. By the membership.

Senator PHIPPS. That is, assessments on the workmen?

Mr. GOMPERS. No. Well, call it assessments or regular dues.

Senator PHIPPS. Regular dues of the employees?

Mr. GOMPERS. Self-sustaining. It is a cooperative effort.

Senator PHIPPS. That is, as compared with one where none of the fund is derived from contributions of the beneficiaries?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Just so we will understand the comparison.

Senator McKELLAR. Of course we will put that into the record, but what percentage of difference is there, just approximately?

Mr. GOMPERS. There are about 61,000 members in the International Typographical Union, as against 268,000 employees of the United

States Steel Corporation. The figures will show that there is a larger percentage of persons receiving the old-age pension from the International Typographical Union than the percentage of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator McKELLAR. There are 61,000 in the Typographical Union and 258,000 or 260,000 in the Steel Corporation?

Mr. GOMPERS. Two hundred and sixty-eight thousand.

Mr. TIGHE. Two hundred and sixty-eight thousand is what they have.

Mr. GOMPERS. I can not say this upon my own authority, but I have been informed from various sources, most of which I have always regarded as reliable, that the old-age pension paid by the corporation is one which goes by favors and kisses. The discrimination is not as a matter of benefit but as a matter of what is known as faithful service; not faithful work, but "faithful"—and I use that word, if I may, in quotation marks—faithful, not to labor, not to their fellow workers, not to the actual service given to the corporation, but for other faithful service.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE PENSION LIST OF THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION AND THE INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION.

The pension system of the United States Steel Corporation was begun in 1901 by Andrew Carnegie for the benefit of the employees of the Carnegie plants. The pension obligations of those subsidiary companies which have put into operation pension systems prior to 1911 were assumed by and merged into a new fund by the United States Steel Corporation.

In 1911, the eleventh year after the establishment of the company fund, the total number of pensioners was 1,606. The total disbursements during 1911 were \$348,480.37.

The International Typographical Union adopted a pension system in 1907, providing for the payment of \$4 a week to members 60 years of age having a continuous active membership of 20 years. In 1911 the pension was increased to \$5 a week. The law now provides two classes of pensioners:

1. Members not less than 60 years of age who have been in continuous good standing for a period of 20 years and will find it impossible to find sustaining employment;

2. Members who are totally incapacitated for work who have been continuous active members for 20 years and whose applications for admission to the Home have been disapproved because their afflictions are such as to render them ineligible to that institution.

This is the comparison between the pensioners of the United States Steel Corporation in 1919:

In the eighteenth year of its existence, 3,000.

The International Typographical Union at the end of 12 years has 1,508. Cost last fiscal year, \$354,020. The employees of the United States Steel Corporation are 268,000, according to figures announced by the company. Percentage of employees who are pensioners, 1.1 per cent. The members of the International Typographical Union are 61,000. Percentage of members who are pensioners, 2.4 per cent, or just double that of the United States Steel Corporation, which has four times the number of employees the union has members.

It has been freely stated and generally understood that the pension roll of the United States Steel Corporation was the refuge of men who had violated their pledges in the union by giving information to the United States Steel Corporation. Favoritism is also charged. If it were true that pensions were paid to men who had reached a certain age after so many years' employment in the mills, there certainly would have been a much larger number than is shown. The number of pensioners of the typographical union demonstrates this.

Mr. GOMPERS. In regard to the hospitals, the information which comes to me, not only from labor sources but from newspaper men

who have been engaged in their work as newspaper men—reporters, investigators, etc.—in and around Chicago where some of these hospitals are, is that when any accident has taken place in the plant that not only are the reporters barred but even police are barred. When an accident occurs these men are in the plants and working. After the accident they are taken out of the plant and into the hospital. They are held there ex communicado with their friends, their families, their own doctors, their own advisers, their counsel, if needs be. These men are held there for the purpose of keeping the company's representatives in constant surveillance of the injured men, with all that that implies.

The statement I am about to make has no reference directly to the United States Steel Corporation, but to another, the Midvale. Some years ago, about eight or nine years ago, the House Committee on Labor met and held hearings upon the eight-hour bill which labor asked to be enacted. Among the witnesses in opposition was the president of the Midvale Co. I can not recall his name. I have been trying to, but can not remember it.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that Mr. D. J. Harrah?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes, sir; Mr. Harrah.

Senator PHIPPS. That was before the change in ownership. The company was afterwards reorganized, consolidated with other plants, and is now owned by the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., I believe.

Mr. GOMPERS. I think that is true, sir; but I want to simply quote as far as my memory will allow me a statement made by Mr. Harrah before the House Committee on Labor, and I think it will be a bit illuminating. It can be found in the printed hearings of the Committee on Labor of the House.

Mr. Harrah opposed the eight-hour day. He said he regarded the question of efficiency of the worker and to work all the time that he could was of prime importance. Questioned upon that matter, he said: "Well, our company buys machines which we expect and which are guaranteed to have a running operating life of five years, but if these machines are not worn out within three years. I want to know something about it."

In other words, the question of men and machines, the driving of them at top speed, to the limit of endurance of the worker, was the first consideration, and not the men, the workers, the humans. If we understand the tendencies of a large number of employers to carry out that policy, and when you apply the question of so-called bonuses, you can imagine what it means to the workers.

Senator PHIPPS. By stating this case of some years ago by the then owner of the Midvale plant, who is no longer interested there and not a party or feature in this present strike, you do not mean to intimate, Mr. Gompers, do you, that that same feeling prevails or is held by even a few of the large employers of labor?

Mr. GOMPERS. I think that there is coming with every day a larger number of employers who want to deal fairly with the workers, and that it is in course of development that these employers will come to the point of not only sitting around the table and discussing these vital interests of the relations between employers and workers dispassionately, calmly, and with a concern for each other's rights, but that then will come the collective bargaining.

I say it with all due respect to the memory of Mr. Baer, the late president of the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad, and who was

very much interested in the anthracite coal strike. Mr. Baer expressed the view, which was largely entertained by employers, that is: "We will not meet them." His view was that he would not talk with representatives of workers; that it was not his intention to deal with employees individually, and that statement has gone down into history, that the employers are the trustees created by God for the administration of the wealth that they have and that the employees are the trustees's wards.

Senator PHIPPS. Which expression was condemned as generally by employers as it was by employees, according to all newspaper accounts that I have ever been able to get hold of.

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes; the condemnation was that he uttered it. The other employers believed and acted upon it. Without a question the attitude of the employer, large or small, who refuses to sit down and talk with the representatives of the men whom they choose, is the same attitude that Mr. Baer expressed. The only difference is that Mr. Baer expressed it; the other gentlemen did not. Mr. Baer, thank goodness, for his own good sake and for the good of the community, lived long enough to change his mind and did meet the men, and after meeting them gladly, gladly reversed his position and later entered into collective bargaining with the representatives of the workmen in the employ of his company.

There is something that occurred to me yesterday. I had a little colloquy and some of my friends thought it was so good I ought to repeat it, that some of the friends of the corporations may be opposed to the league of nations, but they are not opposed to the league of corporations.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gary was not opposed to the league of nations.

Mr. GOMPERS. No; some of them I said. The United States Steel Corporation is a federation of companies and corporations, and these, all of them, speak through the finance committee or the representatives of the United States Steel Corporation, practically a holding company. And yet in that great powerful institution they deny the right of the workers to meet by representatives of their own choosing.

Senator PHIPPS. That should be qualified, Mr. Gompers. For instance, you speak and are the head of 24 international affiliated unions.

Mr. GOMPERS. No, sir. I speak, if I speak at all, for labor; I speak in the name of the 4,000,000 members of all the organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and incidentally, while some may dispute the authority of my credentials—I speak for labor, organized or unorganized.

Senator PHIPPS. And then the figure of 2,000,000 which Secretary Foster and myself were discussing at one time was only 50 per cent of the number—

Mr. GOMPERS (interposing). Of the American Federation of Labor; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And on that basis you are taking annual dues at a very low estimate of \$10 a year, your organization has an income of at least \$10,000,000 to further the interest of labor.

Mr. GOMPERS. I wish you knew the circumstances, Senator. I am sure you would not be guilty of making that statement.

Senator PHIPPS. I am making the statement in order that you may correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. GOMPERS. Let me say this, that the American Federation of Labor, financially considered, is a poverty-stricken organization. The sum total of its revenue is this: One cent per month from the members of all affiliated organizations, 1 cent per month, 12 cents per year, and that is all the income of the American Federation of Labor, and it has only been 1 cent per month since the 1st of August, 1919. Immediately preceding that the revenue was seven-eighths of 1 cent per month; before that three-fourths of 1 cent; before that one-third of 1 cent; before that one-fourth of 1 cent per month.

Senator PHIPPS. But you are speaking of the American Federation as an organization.

Mr. GOMPERS. You asked—

Senator PHIPPS. As to the income that is available, during each year for the purpose of furthering the interests of labor, and I am giving my estimate based on the figures I have been given over this table, and they seem to be something in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000 collected by way of dues from the union men, to say nothing of the initiation fees.

Mr. GOMPERS. May I say this, Senator, that there is not one of these organizations receiving dues, which they do, but which has benefits they pay. For instance, benefit in case of illness, benefit for traveling, benefit to get to the next town and seek employment, and only for such purposes, benefit for the insurance of tools, death benefit, and benefit to the widow or orphans of dependents in case of the member's death; a certain sum set aside for the burial of the wife of a member in the event of her death; and tool insurance. There is not a beneficial institution in all the country or all the world that gives in return so much to the members as the trade unions give to the members. It is mutual, and it is not conducted for profit; it is conducted for mutual benefit. The money to which you refer, whether it be \$40,000,000 or \$100,000,000 would be given in the form of benefits to which I have referred, and only incidentally for strike benefits or lockout benefits. The organizations have no such funds as would be indicated, I believe, by your questions, or as brought out.

Senator PHIPPS. I was simply putting figures together that were given in evidence.

Mr. GOMPERS. I do not think there is any man more diffident and respectful than I am, but I do think that I also have the temerity to express what I think is right, and to express it as fully as I can say, that the idea may be conveyed that I have in mind. The organization in which I owe my primary membership has expended in the past 35 years more than \$15,000,000, in a membership now of about 40,000 or 45,000. I do not know the exact figures. It has expended that sum, or something like that, for the benefits I have enumerated. In the same proportion that the organization has paid money for these benefits they have had to pay less strike benefits and less lockout benefits. So far as the American Federation of Labor itself is concerned, I repeat that our income from three and a quarter million



members—because men who are traveling and men who are sick are immune from all dues—amounting to two hundred and twenty or two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in the federation, has been spent for these activities to which I have referred. It pays for all the education on the line of making or bringing about better concepts and better relations between employers and employees. And it also pays the “fat” salaries to its officers.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Gompers, you are giving the committee information that it has not had before, as the result of the statement I made or the questions I put. There was no intention on my part of couching my question in terms to give you offense, and it does not seem to me that I did; but I think you have displayed a little feeling in making your last statement. Did you misunderstand me?

Mr. GOMPERS. I hope I have not shown I felt offended, because I was not, and I do not so feel. Perhaps I was somewhat emphatic. I think we have all been treated here with the greatest respect—that both sides have been.

Senator PHIPPS. The statement was based on this: For instance, you called attention very pointedly to the fact that the largest corporation in the United States in the steel business was composed of companies and corporations and was represented by one head center, and it occurred to me that while that company was organized in that way it was also true that labor organizations were centralized and intended to act from one center, just as the manufacturing concerns do.

Mr. GOMPERS. May I say a word there?

Senator PHIPPS. Certainly.

Mr. GOMPERS. I think I am safe in saying that no one can ever quote me as having uttered orally or having penned any condemnation of the organization of employers and business men. Before committees I have said that I will not join in the general howl against employers and business men organizing. I do not want to conduct their business, but the illustration having been made, referring to these big companies having organized and confederated, and so on, and labor having organized and federated in the matters which affect the companies and the workers, I say we ought to meet, and I am sure if Judge Gary, as chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation, had addressed a respectful letter to me or a letter couched in respectful terms, I should not have been guilty of the seeming discourtesy of not even acknowledging his letter.

Senator PHIPPS. I did not mean to interrupt you until you had concluded your statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Your 10 minutes are about up, but it is not your fault.

Senator PHIPPS. You referred to some figures, explaining that the strike vote was small, for the reason that men were not permitted to vote until they had been in the organization for at least three months.

Mr. GOMPERS. In some of the organizations; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you the figures on the vote—have they been submitted?

Mr. GOMPERS. Not to me; no, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. There is one little point there: That the opportunity to vote was extended to men who had not yet joined the unions. I do not like to leave you up in the air without calling your attention to that.

Mr. GOMPERS. That may be a fact. I spoke in reference to some of the organizations.

Senator PHIPPS. You stated that in regard to certain organizations?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes.

(Thereupon, at 6.25 p. m., an adjournment was taken until tomorrow, Saturday, Oct. 4, 1919, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

## INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10.30 a. m., in room 235, Senate Office Building. Hon. William S. Kenyon presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Sterling, Phipps, McKellar, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

Also present: J. T. Davies, steel worker, New Castle, Pa.; Joseph Smith, roller, Homestead, Pa.; Ed. M. Lynch, pipe welder, McKeesport, Pa.; Michael F. Tighe, president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Is Mr. Davies in the room?

### STATEMENT OF MR. T. J. DAVIES, OF NEW CASTLE, PA.

The CHAIRMAN. State to the reporter your name, address, and business.

Mr. DAVIES. My name is T. J. Davies, New Castle, Pa., the Shenango Works, and, incidentally, Newcastle Works, two tin mills, representing 5,000 tin-mill workers.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you represent 5,000 tin-mill workers?

Mr. DAVIES. Five thousand tin-mill workers. I am engaged in one plant where they employ 3,200 tin workers.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say you represented tin workers here?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. By what authority? Was any action taken?

Mr. DAVIES. I represent the opinion. I am well acquainted with the working in the mills, with the men, with the phases of this so-called strike that interests us.

The CHAIRMAN. You represent, then, what you believe to be the opinion of the men, but there has been no action taken?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and tell us the conditions in these mills and the opinions of the men. Have you talked with many of the men?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. DAVIES. There is the elements of a conspiracy. We would ask a certain man, moving around mysteriously, what was going on and what their hopes were and what they expected, and they said, "We will cripple this mill." We would say, "How are you going to do that? What are you going to do?" "We are going to get these pickling departments out, these annealing departments, these cold-rolled departments; we are going to paralyze these mills completely." Then we would inquire how they expected to do this from the men who we thought were going to walk out, foreigners. Some of the foreigners said, "Well, we are going to have closed shop, President Wilson, the Senate, President Gompers, are going to give us closed shop. We have jobs, American men, no union men, they no work in our mills, the mills closed to them."

Then we asked them how they were closed to operate this. They talked of the check-off system. "You have to be union men, Government pass you, pay union dues through office."

Senator PHIPPS. Will you repeat that last, please?

Mr. DAVIES. "Government, Senate, pass. You pay dues in office and you have to be union man, and we will hold jobs first, and you have no jobs after union in these mills."

Those were the promises they were holding out to these fellows, a good many of them, so we found out. Then we found out there were some of them would go so far as to say, "No need bosses, no need superintendents, committee run mills, all right." And then we found intimidation to a very far extent among them. It is the business of a man to find out among those fellows why they are wrong; any good American would do that in our mills, and they did so. We asked them, "Why you no come to work?" I have two Greeks working for me. I said to one of them, "Manny, why don't you come to work?" He said, "Greek man go up to my wife, holler in her face, say to my wife, 'Kill your man if your man go to work, kill you, too.'"

Then on the first turn I went to work, the first turn commenced midnight, Sundays. We were assured protection. The city attempted to give it to us.

Senator STERLING. Sunday, what date?

Mr. DAVIES. Sunday means going to work the first turn Monday morning; yo start early, a little after 12 o'clock, to get there in order to start at 12.30 Monday morning, the first turn.

Senator STERLING. What time do you refer to, what date?

Mr. DAVIES. That would be Monday week; that would be last Monday a week, September 22. That is the beginning of the shut-out or the walkout.

Senator STERLING. You mean the strike?

Mr. DAVIES. The beginning of the strike. We went to the main entrance, one of the men working with me; we are nine on the cree, and we arranged to go together, and he drove the car, his own car, and we passed the main entrance, and there was a very large mob standing on the outside of the main entrance, but we passed through it; we did not turn into the mill there; we turned in at the lower entrance and come in the block just as a great big crowd blocked our pathway, or got in front of the machine, and one of them got on the dashboard, and one of my crew says to the other, he says, "Throw

her into second and shoot the gas on and let her run." And she did and we got in. We got into the mill and we were determined to shoot our way in and to shoot our way out if necessary.

Senator STERLING. On what date was that?

Mr. DAVIES. September 22.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men had gone out of the mill then?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, on the first day I judge we would have been about 1,000 short out of the 3,200.

The CHAIRMAN. How many have come back?

Mr. DAVIES. It is very hard to give you exact figures.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many are out now?

Mr. DAVIES. There are now out, I suppose, about—I would guess, about 500. We are under a state of practical military law. The returned soldiers took hold after some of the mob violence, some of the returned soldiers volunteered to protect the place, and then the board of trade held a citizens' meeting, and 186 members of the board of trade, and leading citizens, stood up and took oath at one time under the sheriff of the county, in one meeting. We were afraid of the homes and the institutions of the city, judging by the violence that had occurred on the Monday.

Senator STERLING. When you say they took the oath, you mean they were sworn in as deputies?

Mr. DAVIES. Sworn in as deputies, yes, sir. There are about 700 deputies, and the place is practically, as far as deputies can make it, under military law; and while we have not removed the terrorism from around the homes where the different foreigners live, they are kind of colonized around there, different colonies.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of these men were what you term foreigners that went out?

Mr. DAVIES. The proportion of foreigners would be out of the 1,000, I would say about 99 per cent, or better.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "foreigners" do you mean men born in foreign countries, who have been naturalized, or men who are not naturalized?

Mr. DAVIES. When I say foreigners I mean men who are not naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of those men do not speak the English language?

Mr. DAVIES. Almost all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you get your orders to them?

Mr. DAVIES. The union, or, at least, whoever they are, the American Federation of Labor, is supposed to do it, although they really have nothing to offer us, the American Federation of Labor have not, but they are sending foreigners who can, for instance, speak the Slavic and then the Polish, and then to these other foreigners they send inflammatory literature at different times. For instance, the Poles have a hall; then somebody speaking the Polish language goes to the Polish hall and speaks to those people, and they solidify along that line; and they are pretty solid, and they can extend that in whatever way they want to do in violence and intimidation and all else as the result of these meetings, is our knowledge and experience.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of the men employed in your mill there are what you term foreigners?

Mr. DAVIES. I judge the figures I have already given will hold, because they are about all out.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you of those who have gone out, the men who were employed in your mill?

Mr. DAVIES. All that were employed in the mill are being captured by that element.

The CHAIRMAN. All the foreigners?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is about 1,000.

Mr. DAVIES. That is about 1,000, I judge. That is the nearest I know.

The CHAIRMAN. Then how do you get your orders for safety and matters of that kind to these foreigners in the ordinary operation of the mill?

Mr. DAVIES. We have our interpreters. We have key men in every language; we have our key men in the mills who can speak fair English.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you if there are more accidental injuries to those men who do not speak the English language than those who do?

Mr. DAVIES. I think not, since the extra precautions are being taken—the precautions to machinery as it is working, and then the notices in every language—whatever notice is put up any more is put up in all these different languages, and we have different courses of education from time to time and have for the last few years; that is, the company has, in conjunction with other institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. Do foreign newspapers circulate among these men that can not speak the English language?

Mr. DAVIES. They have literature sometimes; they have pamphlets; then they have their papers, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they have meetings and lectures or talks in their native languages?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir; they have on their own account, some; and then the industrial department of the Y. M. C. A. has taken up classes, working cooperatively with the companies.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they seem to want to learn the English language?

Mr. DAVIES. Oh, yes, sir; that is, the ones who have been any length of time in the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any night schools where they can learn?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir; there are night schools having classes of different kinds, working in conjunction with the company. The industrial and educational part of the Y. M. C. A. work cooperatively with the companies, with the American Tin and Sheet and with the Carnegie Steel.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any advancement being made in these men learning the English language?

Mr. DAVIES. Positively.

The CHAIRMAN. What about their homes, their women, and children?

Mr. DAVIES. Their homes are being cared for. We have visiting nurses, and they are improving matters from the standpoint of cleanliness and sanitary conditions. The mills take care of the homes particularly in and around the mills; they do that where they

do not enter the houses. In the homes everything is being done to improve matters along healthful and sanitary lines.

The CHAIRMAN. Do these children of the foreigners attend the public schools?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir. and they have systematic play, also. The teachers of the public schools have caught the spirit of Americanizing the children of the mills, shall I call them?

Senator STERLING. How large are the houses in which they live, as a rule?

Mr. DAVIES. The houses they live in are houses formerly occupied by respectable American workmen—those that have moved to better parts of the city, to better homes.

Senator STERLING. How many rooms to a family, as a rule, in these houses?

Mr. DAVIES. Oh, they have about four—anywhere from four to six rooms. I should add there that they sometimes crowd themselves. Occasionally there is a boarding house where there are a good many men. They grow out of that as they become Americanized.

Senator STERLING. Do those buildings belong to the company?

Mr. DAVIES. Some of them; but not to any extent in New Castle. There they originally were owned by workmen who had built them and who sold them to these other people who occupy them now. The companies occupy very few houses in and around the mills at New Castle. We have 10,000 men and women on the rolls of our plants there.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the conditions in these homes of the foreigners?

Mr. DAVIES. As a rule they are good. The visiting nurses get on the inside. As a rule they are clean. They are getting better than they were; they get better right along.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there much sickness among them?

Mr. DAVIES. No; that is followed up very quickly by the doctors—the mill doctors—and the mill nurses. The Carnegie Steel Co., the Newcastle works and the Shenango works have their nurses and they attend to all those things. They get to any sickness very quickly. The men who report it to the foremen of the different foreign nationalities and it gets attention very quickly.

Senator STERLING. Are there any hospitals?

Mr. DAVIES. Oh, yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Who provides the hospitals?

Mr. DAVIES. The companies. Then there are two hospitals in the city. They have doctors in the city that take care of the outside work and the company takes care of them.

Senator STERLING. Is medical attendance and hospital attendance furnished free to the workman and his family?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; where they are dependent. They get to a state of independence very quickly, and they select their own doctors. A good many of these foreigners become Americanized very quickly and become independent in good time.

Senator PHIPPS. In your work you are in charge of a crew of nine men?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You can make yourself understood in giving orders to any of the employees?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. They all quickly acquire a little English?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; they do. They devour it.

Senator PHIPPS. You referred to violence which, I think, from your statement, occurred about the time of the walkout?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir; it occurred on the first turn.

Senator PHIPPS. Of what did that consist; what was the extent of the violence?

Mr. DAVIES. In one case they just picked up a Ford machine and turned it right around and the whole crew had to start the other way. There was about 1,000 of them and they increased from the first to the second and third turns. The first turn they didn't stop us; we got in.

Senator PHIPPS. They tried to stop you?

Mr. DAVIES. They tried to stop the machine; if we had stopped once it would not have moved again; we kept going. That was the first turn. When they found out there were 15 mills out of 30 running they became aggravated and increased in number on the following turn; and on the following turn members of my family passed in. They stopped them going in. They stopped some going in on the first turn. They stopped some of my crew going in on the first turn—one man—and he turned back on account of his wife; he got scared. On the second turn they increased in number. They had three Americans. I seen the crowd and they had 3 Americans out of about 500.

They increased, and on the third turn they became bolder. They whipped the city police; they whipped the county police; they stabbed one of the policemen, and they stabbed the other—and three of our men they took into the crowd and beat up mercilessly. My brother came out of the mill and they tried to stop that machine, but they got away somehow.

There was about 1,000 people there. They have beat these men and beat the police and whipped the county police and these others, and when there became such a large crowd, about 40 returned soldiers volunteered to be deputy sheriffs and were deputized. They found some bayonets and fixed their bayonets on their guns and started in on duty to scatter the mobs of foreigners that were everywhere around the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. What town was that?

Mr. DAVIES. Newcastle.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, with respect to this crowd that congregated around the mill entrance, was that composed entirely of strikers, or was it reenforced by men who were not interested in the operation of the mill?

Mr. DAVIES. They were composed almost—well, about entirely of strikers; and on the third turn their wives came with them; that was toward the third turn, and that is the only exception of outsiders.

What I have described applies to the three plants.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you a native-born American?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been in this country?



Mr. DAVIES. Twenty-four years.

Senator PHIPPS. I assume you are an American citizen now; are you?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your position or job in the plant?

Mr. DAVIES. I am a tin-plate roller now. I worked my way up all the way.

Senator PHIPPS. You have a crew of men, containing some of these men——

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What are your hours of work? Are you on an eight-hour turn?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. There are three shifts in the plant, are there?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And the eight-hour day is the basic day, is it?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir. We have some 12, so-called 12, and some about 10. Of the so-called 12-hour men we have some.

Senator PHIPPS. Are the 10 and 12 hour men the large proportion, or is that the small——

Mr. DAVIES. Oh, they get good money.

Senator PHIPPS. No; I mean as to number. What proportion work 10 or 12 hours?

Mr. DAVIES. The proportion is very small.

Senator PHIPPS. About what are your average earnings?

Mr. DAVIES. Do you mean mine?

Senator PHIPPS. Your own personally, which you keep for yourself.

Mr. DAVIES. I average \$17 a day. The lowest paid man on my crew makes \$7.50, and he is a Greek.

Senator PHIPPS. The lowest paid workman in your crew receives on an average of \$7.50 per day?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; and he is a Greek.

Senator PHIPPS. Have any of your crew complained about the smallness of their wages, saying that they ought to have more?

Mr. DAVIES. Not necessarily. Of course, we are all dead willing to take more. I think they have received two advances, but I don't know what they were, while I was away. I have been away 15 months in France and just returned eight weeks ago. They have received, I think, two advances.

Senator PHIPPS. What was your mission in France?

Mr. DAVIES. I was a Y. M. C. A. worker.

Senator STERLING. Of what nationalities are most of the foreigners in your mills?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, the Poles are very strong. The Slavs are strong. I do not know exactly what the Slavs comprehend, but I judge they would take in the men from Finland, and perhaps a Russian Pole; but I should say a number of Poles and Slavs, Greeks, Italians, Roumanians, and, I think, Syrians. Those are about the largest nationalities we have.

Senator STERLING. Take those who opposed your going into the mills that day, where you said nearly all of them were foreigners, and of what nationality were most of them, so far as you could tell?

Mr. DAVIES. Very largely Poles and Slavs, including Finlanders. They have halls where the agitators can meet the men in greater numbers, and they were the greater number consequently in the mobs.

Senator PHIPPS. Before this walkout, was any strike vote taken in your plant?

Mr. DAVIES. No; they would not even tell us what was going on.

Senator PHIPPS. There were no ballots distributed on which the men could vote?

Mr. DAVIES. Understand, in their meetings, held under I don't know what auspices, but possibly that of the Amalgamated Association and the American Federation of Labor combined—there were 10,000 workmen in some of those, and they may have taken a vote. We didn't even know what was going on. We were asking each other; we asked some of the English-speaking fellows what was doing, so we knew of no vote.

Senator STERLING. What proportion of the men in the mill were union men?

Mr. DAVIES. I know of one-fourth of 1 per cent Americans, about 7 or 8, and then I saw a parade on Labor Day, and they had out of the three mills about 200 foreigners. I would not be able to give you any figures that there were in our mill; that is, in the Shenango mill alone.

Senator STERLING. Then, you mean to say that the great proportion of men in the three mills are nonunion men?

Mr. DAVIES. Oh, yes, yes; by long odds.

Senator STERLING. Was there ever any discrimination made against union men, to your knowledge?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. They were treated the same as other men?

Mr. DAVIES. I think so. I have worked with them and have held conversations with those I know. Everything is quite agreeable with us, and with the management, so far as I know.

Senator STERLING. Are there any union men in your immediate crew?

Mr. DAVIES. In the next crew to me, the president was in the crew, and I used to have talks with him, and I tried to get him to tell me what was doing, like the most of us were doing. We wanted to know what was doing.

Senator STERLING. That was in a perfectly friendly way?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; and he took it in good part. He never asked us to join. We got along there friendly with them.

Senator STERLING. You say that in the next crew to you was a union man who was the president of a union?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Of what union?

Mr. DAVIES. Of the Amalgamated Association.

Senator PHIPPS. You were not personally asked to join the union?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Were the Americans of your crew asked to join the union?

Mr. DAVIES. I asked them directly. I said: "Fellows, do you know what is going on? Have any of you been approached?" None of us could get anything out of them. As I said, it had elements of conspiracy because they would not tell us what was going on.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, from time to time, as little differences have arisen in the mills, questions of working conditions or any complaints that might arise, have those complaints been put up to the foremen, the superintendent, or to you?

Mr. DAVIES. Why, the humblest man in the mill, foreign or American, does not have to accept finally anything from them. Any grievance he may want to make he can make it to the foreman, and if the foreman won't take it up, he can just simply open the door of the main office and walk right in to the superintendent. That condition obtains, to the best of my knowledge and belief—to my knowledge, all through the operations of the company. If grievances are felt, the humblest man in the mill can walk past the foreman right to the general superintendent and get things remedied very quickly.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know of any instances where committees have been appointed to present these grievances to the superintendent?

Mr. DAVIES. I have never known of the necessity. Each man, all of us, can go off-handedly, if we like, to the superintendent. We do not have to stop at the foreman. We can take it to the manager. Things that they want remedied. For instance we had a complaint which was a big one, and it was taken to the assistant superintendent. It was a roughers' question.

Senator STERLING. What?

Mr. DAVIES. A rougher's question. The roughers were asked to do something. They were asked to lift bars and put them in a place which was supposed to be of advantage to the company, and the foreman said, "You have got to lift them." Some of the boys told him it was not necessary, and they took their complaint to the manager. He said it would be immediately attended to and it was changed. That was a pretty good-sized committee. I suppose there were about 25 or 30, and that is a good-sized committee. They went in there to the manager and took their case up, and they didn't have to do the extra lifting, the extra carrying of the bars from here to there. It was only a matter of about 18 inches of lift which they saved by making the complaint to the superintendent, but it was listened to and attended to.

The CHAIRMAN. You still have the 12-hour day there?

Mr. DAVIES. Among the stationary engineers. I think the stationary engineers are the only ones that work the 12 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. How long do the others work?

Mr. DAVIES. Ten, I think, to the best of my knowledge. They check in at 7 and out at 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not there a good deal of complaint about a 10-hour day, that they desire an eight-hour day?

Mr. DAVIES. Not with any reason in it, so far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think there is any reason in the complaint for an eight-hour day?

Mr. DAVIES. What I mean is that there are no men that think it reasonable. They have their hours in between. I do not know whether I am correct in my statements there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you work in this mill yourself?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your work?

Mr. DAVIES. Rolling tin plate. I put the plates in the rolls. I roll it.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long do you work a day?

Mr. DAVIES. I suppose seven hours. I work eight hours, you understand, but we work half in and half out. It is very strenuous work, and if you could see us at the end of a turn, we look the part. Our eyes are sunken. We work eight hours, understand.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your compensation?

Mr. DAVIES. \$17 a day, about.

The CHAIRMAN. How many days a week do you work?

Mr. DAVIES. Five.

The CHAIRMAN. Did men formerly do the same work as you do seven days a week?

Mr. DAVIES. Nobody works more than I do.

The CHAIRMAN. They could not do it?

Mr. DAVIES. They could not do it. They could not work six days a week and keep it up long at our rate. We work the extra day every third week, and at the end of that we are like a rocket, about blown up.

The CHAIRMAN. It is pretty hard work?

Mr. DAVIES. There are very few of our men at the end of a turn that do not go home with their eyes sunken, the heat and then the tremendous pace we go. There is the hard work and the heat we have to stand and the watchfulness of the work.

The CHAIRMAN. How many years have you stood that kind of work?

Mr. DAVIES. I have been at it—I have been rolling 18 years. I have been in the mills 34.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not a member of the union?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir; not for 10 years. I was for 14.

The CHAIRMAN. How many years were you a member of the union?

Mr. DAVIES. I was a member of the Amalgamated Association for 14 years.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have been 10 years out of it?

Mr. DAVIES. Ten years out of it.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any reasons for believing that the men in your plant should unionize in their own interest and belong to a union?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir. I do not know of any labor union that has got anything to offer us. Most of our men have been members of the Amalgamated Association.

Senator PHIPPS. It is your opinion that they do not care to again?

Mr. DAVIES. I most certainly do not.

Senator PHIPPS. What are their reasons for wanting to stay out of the union?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, leaving well enough alone, it seems like, in general principles. The Amalgamated Association, in our estimation, has been a spent force since 1901, and the American Federation of Labor are not offering us anything. They are only holding things for combined labor. The only association that has anything to offer us, or presumes to have, is the Amalgamated Association.

Senator PHIPPS. Then it is your opinion that if the men in your mill, as a rule, were paying dues into the Amalgamated Association, they would not get value received?

Mr. DAVIES. Why, sure. It would be robbery if you would take our money away and pay it into the Amalgamated Association. It would be robbing us of our money without giving us anything in return.

Senator PHIPPS. When you were a member of the union the skilled workers were all members, were they?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. There were men, skilled workers, who did not belong to the union?

Mr. DAVIES. Certainly. In 1909, when we went into the big strike, I was at the Laughlin mill at Martins Ferry, Ohio. We had 18 men out of a possible 105, and we went into a union strike to unionize nonunion mills. I went to New Castle, where there was a possible membership of 5,000, and there were 38 in good standing, and we went into a strike to unionize nonunion mills.

Senator PHIPPS. Is the union man in danger of being called out on a sympathy strike?

Mr. DAVIES. The union man is in danger of being called out at the notion of any agitator who wants to go and rush anything in of his own notion at any particular time, and if a spirit of Bolshevism pervades the country, as there does at the present time, and he wants to call the people out on strike, he can do so, and they can resort to mob violence, and the labor unions will espouse a cause of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen any indication of Bolshevism?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir, I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us about that.

Mr. DAVIES. That is conducted like a conspiracy. That is the beginning of it. And I told you that some of these poor, misguided foreigners told me that they did not need any bosses in the mills, that the committee could run the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, their committee?

Mr. DAVIES. Our committees after we were organized, and then I told you that the weapons used were terrorism, intimidation, threats to kill and threats to burn, and mob violence on the outside to stop the Americans from going in there, and they were not even naturalized. I tell you that that is labor Bolshevism.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think this doctrine of running the mills by committee is being taught and preached through that region.

Mr. DAVIES. It certainly is, and you have developed the facts right here from men that are apostles of it. We are perfectly satisfied that they are set against all the institutions that there are in this country. They are set against capital, against organized government. After they whipped the mills in Newcastle, they showed the elements there. It is a wonder that they did not go and burn down the institutions and burn the homes, and we are expecting it.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you really think that the companies ought to know that and look into that when they employ these men? Do you think those companies ought to employ men who are against the institutions of this country?

Mr. DAVIES. They could not anticipate the development, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think you could tell a Bolshevik when you employ him?

Mr. DAVIES. The Bolshevik spirit has never been as strong in this country as it is to-day, and some of these men were employed perhaps four, five or six years ago. This spirit of organized resistance is one that is growing, and it is perhaps at its crest now.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it has developed among the men since their employment?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not there a great turnover of men there? Are they not continually employing new men and employing foreigners?

Mr. DAVIES. Not in the skilled positions.

The CHAIRMAN. In the unskilled?

Mr. DAVIES. We do not have enough unskilled men to affect us in that way. I would not be able to judge the unskilled part of the foreigners. But pardon me for suggesting to you, Senator, along that line, it is the organized attempt and the inflaming along those lines and the wrong education that has brought this about just at present.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am getting at is this. I am interested in this Americanization question just as much as this strike question. Don't you think there is some responsibility upon the mills and the employers of this country, steel and all, take them all in, not to employ men just to get their labor, when these men are opposed to the institutions of this country?

Mr. DAVIES. Positively, and the Government should join with them and even put them out of the country and shoot them, if necessary.

Senator PHIPPS. You were a union man until 10 years ago?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You have tried to follow this present situation as closely as you could?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it your judgment that the policy of the union organization, as now being carried on in this strike, is different from that which it was 15 years ago, say in 1909, or 1901, when you first joined the union? Is it more radical now than it was when those other strikes were under way?

Mr. DAVIES. The other strikes really were dominated by a radical element, not as radical as to-day, but by a radical element, and the leaders usually in trades-unions are following—they won't fight back when there is a mob spirit on of that kind, because their jobs are at stake. They cater to the popular party, and if it is popular to allow rabid socialism as it was 15 years ago, to call for a big strike like the 1901 strike, the leaders would not take a stand to stem the tide, for fear it will hurt their popularity. At times in the past and just at present, it has been stated here that when they are challenged to go and fight the United States Steel Corporation they yield to that challenge and fight that combination, instead of leading their people to a middle ground of peace, where it is honorable peace, and where trouble might be averted. To-day it is the rabid element that has captured the leaders, and then the leaders in turn are fed that inflamed spirit in the revolution that we are in at the present time.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not know whether you thoroughly understood my question or not, but what I wanted to learn from you is whether or not, in your judgment, there is a new element in this present strike caused by this spirit of Bolshevism to which you refer.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir; positively. I saw it before I came here. I saw it on the streets of Paris.

The CHAIRMAN. On the streets of Paris?

Mr. DAVIES. On the streets of Paris on May day, when Bolshevism was there in tens of thousands.

The CHAIRMAN. This strike had not been called then.

Mr. DAVIES. No; but the evidence of Bolshevism, the air around our mills can compare very favorably with the appearance in the faces of those people that were very largely not responsible for what they were being fed up with in Bolshevism.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not call Mr. Tighe a radical leader, would you?

Mr. DAVIES. No, no. He is quite harmless.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not class Mr. Gompers as a radical, do you?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, Mr. Gompers is president of the American Federation of Labor, and he has to hold his job.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that that is a fair answer to the question?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I would not like to be personal. Mr. Gompers was so extremely kind to Mr. Foster, and helped him considerably yesterday; the poor fellow did not get quite up perhaps, but you have led me on to this, and I have answered this question.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you the questions if you considered Mr. Gompers one of the radical leaders, and your answer was that he was trying to hold his job. Don't you think that that was rather unkind?

Mr. DAVIES. I did not mean to be unkind, but Mr. Gompers has to adhere to the opinion of the leaders if the leaders decide upon a certain course, whether it has a Bolshevik tendency or not. Is that a fair answer?

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that the radical leaders are trying to get possession of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. DAVIES. They have and failed. They have before and failed.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you think that is an issue in this investigation?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And would you consider Mr. Gompers a radical leader? I suppose that you consider Mr. Foster one of the radical leaders? Would you consider Mr. Gompers a radical leader?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, from that standpoint, Mr. Gompers is not a radical leader.

The CHAIRMAN. And, in fact, he has been regarded as a rather conservative force, has he not?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir. I said they had tried before and failed; the radicals had tried to capture the association and failed.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a delegate to the 1902 convention of the Amalgamated Association, were you?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you have anything to do with the strike of 1901?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your part in that strike?

Mr. DAVIES. I was national deputy vice president.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you have some active participation in that strike?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you supported the strike, did you?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what did the men strike for?

Mr. DAVIES. They struck to unionize all the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. You supported that strike, you say?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And since then you have changed your mind?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any more questions of Mr. Davies?

Senator PHIPPS. I have no more.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

#### STATEMENT OF JOSEPH SMITH, ROLLER, HOMESTEAD, PA.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, give us your business and address.

Mr. SMITH. My name is Joseph Smith, and my home is at Homestead, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your business?

Mr. SMITH. Roller; mill roller.

The CHAIRMAN. In the mills?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many men are employed there and are working there?

Mr. SMITH. There are about 40 men in the department where I am employed.

The CHAIRMAN. In your department?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are employed in the entire mill?

Mr. SMITH. Well, between 9,000 and 10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many of those are what are termed foreigners?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I would say about 3,500 to 4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many of them are in your department, or gang?

Mr. SMITH. Why, about 15.

The CHAIRMAN. And can they speak the English language?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what do you mean by "foreigners"? Do you mean those that were born in a foreign country?

Mr. SMITH. Those that were born in a foreign country; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And can all of those 3,500 who are employed in the mill speak the English language?

Mr. SMITH. Well, those that are working with me can, and nearly every one of them can speak the English language so that you can understand them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of a union?



Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you cease to be a member of a union?

Mr. SMITH. 1892.

The CHAIRMAN. And since then you have not been a member of any union?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what wages do you receive, may I ask, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Well, on an average, about \$22 or \$23 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. \$22 to \$24 a day?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Doing what?

Mr. SMITH. Rolling.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many hours do you work?

Mr. SMITH. Twelve hours.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many days in the week?

Mr. SMITH. Six days.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that hard work?

Mr. SMITH. Sometimes it is and sometimes it is a little easy. We have to take it as it comes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you talked with the different men in the mills about any troubles or complaints which would cause this strike?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; I spoke to a few of those fellows that had joined the union. I asked them what was the reason of them joining the union, and they said that they wanted to get eight hours a day and \$8 a day.

Senator STERLING. And were those men who had just recently joined the union?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; they only started the union in Homestead about three months since. That is about the time, that the organizers came around to Homestead.

Senator STERLING. Were there any union men in the Homestead mills prior to that time?

Mr. SMITH. I could not say whether there were any union men in the Homestead mills prior to that time. I could not answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been an active campaign to secure members of the union?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir, in the foreign element. They do not want the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by that?

Mr. SMITH. They do not want the American people to attend their meetings; they just want the foreign element to attend their meetings. They do not want any English speaking people to attend their meetings.

Senator STERLING. Why do you think that? Why do they not want the American English-speaking class to come to their meetings? How do you know that?

Mr. SMITH. Well, we have the evidence to prove that by men who went there and they were told to get out.

Senator STERLING. And those were Americans?

Mr. SMITH. Those were Americans.

Senator STERLING. Was there any reason given?

Mr. SMITH. The reason was given that they thought they were spies, and that they would carry the news back to the works.

The CHAIRMAN. How many went out in this mill?

Mr. SMITH. Why, I believe there are about 3,000 to 4,000 men gone out.

The CHAIRMAN. Three thousand to 4,000 men?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is it, 3,000 or 4,000?

Mr. SMITH. Well now, there is nearer 4,000 than 3,000.

The CHAIRMAN. But you said there were about 3,500 foreigners in the mill.

Mr. SMITH. Well, there may be more or less of foreigners, you know. There is a good many of them naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. Have any of the Americans gone out on this strike?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; I do not believe there is a dozen men of Americans gone out on the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. And how do these people live who go out on the strike?

Mr. SMITH. I guess that they have received a little money—have saved a little money in the last few years. In the last few years we have been making quite a little money; and they have been saving some, and they have that money.

The CHAIRMAN. Do many of those men own their own homes?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; a great many have bought up there, considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. And did any of those who own their own homes go out on the strike?

Mr. SMITH. Well, there are a good many people who have gone out on the strike that do not belong to the union, but they have been intimidated to do it, and they are afraid to go into the mill.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by being intimidated and afraid to go into the mill?

Mr. SMITH. They are afraid of being beat up.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you yourself personally seen any intimidation?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it been a peaceful strike?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; it has been a peaceful strike.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been no violence?

Mr. SMITH. Well, we have had a little clash once in a while with the constabulary, where they have congregated and would not move on when asked.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they been holding any meetings?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They have been holding meetings?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. Twice a day, and the only restriction is that they must keep within the bounds instead of making inflammatory speeches.

The CHAIRMAN. And have the meetings been held in a hall?

Mr. SMITH. They have been held in a hall; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And there has been no interference with the meetings?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; there has been no interference with the meetings.

Senator PHIPPS. And those are meetings held by the strikers?

Mr. SMITH. Those are meetings held by the strikers.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have seen no indication of any disorder at all in Homestead?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of the men coming back to work?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; on Tuesday when I left—I worked on Tuesday morning, there were five men who came back to work in my department.

Senator PHIPPS. In your department?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Where you are employed?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what do these men earn whom you refer to?

Mr. SMITH. Why, they earn about \$6 or \$7.

The CHAIRMAN. A day?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you any complaint to make about yourself?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what do these common laborers get in the mills, do you know?

Mr. SMITH. They get for 12 hours—they receive \$5.10, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. And is there any complaint about the 12-hour day?

Mr. SMITH. There is some little complaint, but we do not actually work the 12 hours. We have a rest for lunch at 9.30, and again at 12.30, and in the afternoon we stop to adjust things around the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. And don't you think that there would be less dissatisfaction in the mills if it were put upon an eight-hour basis?

Mr. SMITH. That may be.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not an advocate of the 12-hour day, are you?

Mr. SMITH. No; I would stand eight hours just as well as the next man.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you think that you could stand 12 hours a day?

Mr. SMITH. I have been standing 12 hours a day for the last 33 years that I have been working there.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you think a man can keep that up, 12 hours a day and six days a week?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know, sir. I have been working in the machine department for 33 years; and, while I do not work pretty hard at times, at times I do work pretty hard.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your age? You do not look so old.

Mr. SMITH. My age is 58 years old.

Senator STERLING. And what is your nationality, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Welsh. I was born in England in 1862, in January.

Senator PHIPPS. You referred to 1892. I believe at that time there was a strike on at Homestead.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you in the Homestead plant at that time?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And you were a member of the union at that time?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. I was a member of Thomas Marlow Lodge.

Senator PHIPPS. When did you go back to work after the strike?

Mr. SMITH. I was back—I went back in January, 1893. I was out six months.

Senator PHIPPS. You were out six months?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, after you went back in 1893, did you have to get along with less pay than you were averaging before the strike?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I did not receive my old wage when I went back. I had to work up. I had to go down to the bottom and work up again where I had been working for five years.

Senator PHIPPS. But the position you held before the strike—that was in June, 1892—

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. The man who succeeded you got that job?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Did he have to get along with considerably less earnings than you had received prior to June, 1892?

Mr. SMITH. No; there was not much difference in the earnings. They could not turn out the output as well as we could before the strike. They were not so well acquainted with the work as the old fellows were.

Senator PHIPPS. But is it your opinion that if you had gone back within 30 or 60 days, gone back to your old job, you would have been receiving and earning just as much as you did before the strike?

Mr. SMITH. Well, that would not have done, for me to have gone back in 30 days or they would have called me a scab.

Senator PHIPPS. I understand, but I am asking that question with this idea in mind: It has been stated here that the strike was against a reduction in wages in 1892.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And that it was against a reduction of the rate.

Mr. SMITH. Well, we were working at that time on a sliding scale, on the price of billets, and Mr. Frick wanted to reduce the minimum from 25 to 22½.

Senator PHIPPS. While you were working as a union man in 1892, was there any limitation on the output of the mill that you were employed in fixed by the union?

Mr. SMITH. No; not any; not at that time.

Senator PHIPPS. Not at that time?

Mr. SMITH. Not at that time; no. You know the structural mill at that time was in its infancy at that time. We had only been working about four years on the structural work. The 33-inch mills started, I believe, in 1886, and we used to break the slabs and send them down to Twenty-ninth and Thirty-third Streets to finish them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further?

Senator PHIPPS. I would like to ask the witness one question, as to whether or not he would like again to affiliate with a union—

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And become a union man?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And do you think that is the general feeling of the men who work with you?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. Well, there is not many of the men who worked with me at that time there now. They have passed away.

Senator PHIPPS. But I mean, do you think that is the general feeling of the men who work there now?

Mr. SMITH. The men working now, I do not think they care to join the union. They feel more satisfied all the way through. If they want to complain, if they have a grievance, they go to the foreman, and if you are not satisfied with that you refer it to the superintendent and you get a fair hearing.

Senator STERLING. Is there any trouble about that at all?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; there is no trouble about that. I am speaking now facts, and I am speaking the truth. I heard some things about the plant, the conditions in our plant; they say it is terrible. I want to say that from a sanitary standpoint there is not a plant in the United States that can compete in cleanliness with the plant at Homestead. We have our toilets there, and we have our showers and everything connected around, and every man can take his bath there. He does not have to go home, but he can take a shower right there.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the common laborer do that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; anyone of them can. We have a shower in every department, a toilet and a lavatory, and everything else. We have a man looking after all those places. It is quite different from what it used to be.

Senator PHIPPS. Have the working conditions improved in the Homestead plant?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; any one of them can. We have a shower in

The CHAIRMAN. When did that improvement take place?

Mr. SMITH. Well, within the last six or seven years, sir.

Senator STERLING. I want to ask you something about the 12-hour day. Have you a basic eight-hour day?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And when they work 12 hours a day they receive extra compensation?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; after you work eight hours a day you get time and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that true throughout the mills?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How about the living conditions that you have in Homestead?

Mr. SMITH. The living conditions in Homestead are high—high.

Senator PHIPPS. I mean the rents—

Mr. SMITH. I mean rents, yes; rents and all the commodities and everything there—everything is high.

Senator PHIPPS. Everything is high, you say? What I was getting at was the comparison of the comfort in which the workmen could live nowadays as compared with 1892. You say there has been

improvement in the working conditions in the mills. Has there been any improvement in the living conditions? Do the men have better houses?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, yes; far better houses.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there much crowding in tenements?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; with the foreign element there is.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that necessary—is it necessary for them to crowd in because they can not afford to live better?

Mr. SMITH. Well, they haven't new houses around there. You can take the Homestead works alone and there are 20 per cent living outside Homestead. We haven't houses enough to supply the people that work in Homestead.

Senator STERLING. What proportion of the workmen own their own homes?

Mr. SMITH. I would say 60 per cent own their own homes.

Senator STERLING. Does the company rent houses to the workmen?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What do you say about the character, the kind of houses furnished by the company?

Mr. SMITH. They have some new houses that they have put up the last year; they put up about 100 houses last year. They rent from \$28 to \$30 a month—six rooms and a bath.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you own your own home, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You need not apply this to yourself, but I want to find out what the rule is. Suppose a workman has money enough ahead to pay for a piece of ground, will the company loan him money to enable him to build a house on it?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. At reasonable rates?

Mr. SMITH. Reasonable rates—6 per cent.

Senator PHIPPS. And allow him to pay for it in installments?

Mr. SMITH. You pay for it in installments; yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Would those installments be much greater than the ordinary rental you would have to pay for the same kind of a house? Say he is building a house of the same character as the houses that are renting for \$28 or \$30 a month, would he have to pay off on his purchase at a much higher rate than \$30 a month?

Mr. SMITH. No; the company hardly ever do that. When you have a lot of ground and borrow money from them, they take the mortgage on that and you pay the company that at so much per month interest. and you can pay a little over the interest. That is the way they mostly do. You pay the interest and pay so much more. Suppose, now, you want to pay \$15 or \$20 more than the interest—that is the way they loan the money out.

Senator PHIPPS. Then your payments would not amount in all to much more, if any more, than the ordinary rental you would have to pay for the same kind of a house?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Have you some idea of the cost of construction of those 100 houses that you say have been built recently—the houses with six rooms and a bath?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. Well, to-day the cost is pretty nearly double of what it was several years ago. I don't know what the cost was

then. I know the company lets them out on a contract, builds so many at once, and I don't know exactly what the figures would be.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you a stockholder in the steel company?

Mr. SMITH. I have a few shares, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Is it a general practice among the men to buy stock from the Steel Corporation?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a stockholder?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much stock?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, I have a few shares.

The CHAIRMAN. How many? Don't you want to answer?

Mr. SMITH. About 30.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions we are much obliged to you.

Mr. SMITH. I have a few preferred, sir. I thought you asked if I had any preferred.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't understand you.

Mr. SMITH. I thought you asked me if I had any preferred stock.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you if you had any stock.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I have some common stock, and a few preferred besides.

#### STATEMENT OF ED. M. LYNCH.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give your name and address?

Mr. LYNCH. Ed. M. Lynch, McKeesport, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you working in any of these steel mills?

Mr. LYNCH. I am a pipe welder in the National Tube.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours a day do you work?

Mr. LYNCH. I work 10 and 10 minutes on day turn and 12 hours on night turn.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your compensation?

Mr. LYNCH. I make about \$11 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you worked?

Mr. LYNCH. Do you mean for the company?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. About 34 or 35 years.

The CHAIRMAN. I am almost afraid to ask you your age. What is your age?

Mr. LYNCH. Fifty years.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been the general nature of your work there?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, I have had what is termed the hardest job in the mill, where I work, the heaviest job.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the union?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir; when I was a boy.

The CHAIRMAN. But not since then?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir. Thirty years or more since then.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are working in the mill where you work?

Mr. LYNCH. In the entire plant?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. I suppose there are between 7,000 and 8,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of those men are what may be termed foreigners?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, I would dare say half.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men have gone out from that mill on this strike?

Mr. LYNCH. In the entire plant I would imagine about 10 per cent have gone out.

The CHAIRMAN. What per cent of those 10 per cent are foreigners?

Mr. LYNCH. I would say about 4 or 5 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they talked with you about their grievances?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you understand to be their grievances?

Mr. LYNCH. That is what I have been trying to find out.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you talked with them to find out?

Mr. LYNCH. No; I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. How have you tried to find out, then?

Mr. LYNCH. With the men I work with. I go to them and ask them what the trouble is, and some say that they want eight hours, and different suggestions they make; but the majority of men working where I work don't belong to the union. There are very few of them belong, and I really haven't been able to find out all the details of what they do want.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you charge of a gang of men?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have any of your gang gone out?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of them members of the union?

Mr. LYNCH. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of them foreigners?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many?

Mr. LYNCH. Three or four. I have 16 or 18 men working with me, and 3 or 4 of those men are foreigners—possibly 6 if them are foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. Can they speak the English language?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir. Not as distinctly as an American, but you can understand them very well when you are talking to them.

Senator STERLING. What is the nationality of the foreigners that are in your crew?

Mr. LYNCH. Serbians; and I have one Russian that works with me, and I have a couple of Polish men—three or four Polish men.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard no complaints, then, in the mills at all?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir; no, sir. In our mill you would hardly know there is a strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you asked to join the union?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Were any of your crew asked, as far as you know?

Mr. LYNCH. Not that I know of.

Senator PHIPPS. When talking with your men do you know whether or not they would like to join the union?



Mr. LYNCH. Well, all the American men that I have talked to in our mill don't want to join the union.

Senator STERLING. Has there been any attempt to prevent the organization of unions at your mill?

Mr. LYNCH. Sir?

Senator STERLING. Has there been any attempt to prevent men from joining the union?

Mr. LYNCH. You mean in regard to the officials of the mills stopping them?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir; not that I know of.

Senator STERLING. No attempt by foremen or superintendents to prevent the men from joining the union?

Mr. LYNCH. Not that I know of. You can use your own judgment about that, you know.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know of any cases of men being let out because they had joined the union?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a stockholder in the Steel Corporation?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much stock?

Mr. LYNCH. Five shares of common stock at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Any preferred?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir; I did have more stock, but I sold the stock not long ago.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you own your own home?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you rent from the company?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do many of these men working with you own stock of the steel company?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, yes; a good many men working with me own stock. It is a very common thing for each man that works in the plant usually to buy stock, and even lots of foreigners buy it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the company encourage that policy?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, they post up a notice; it is there in the mill. If you want to go in and buy the stock it's all right, and if you don't it's all right. They don't insist on it.

The CHAIRMAN. You say a good many foreigners buy the stock?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Any of these foreigners out on a strike, do you know whether any of them are stockholders?

Mr. LYNCH. No doubt. I believe they are.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you hear any doctrines among those foreigners against the Government?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, no; I don't think I could say I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a spirit of Bolshevism among the foreign element there?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, I would not hardly know how to answer that. I don't know of any.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know of any?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If that doctrine was being prominently preached around the works you would probably know of it, would you not?

Mr. LYNCH. I think I would; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Davies, the first witness here, thought there was a good deal of it.

Mr. LYNCH. Well, he works at Newcastle, and they are having a good bit of trouble in that district; and right in our town, McKeesport, we haven't had any trouble.

Senator STERLING. You say at your plant you would hardly know there was a strike?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. How many men did you say were employed at your plant?

Mr. LYNCH. Between 7,000 and 8,000 in the entire plant.

Senator STERLING. Do you know what proportion of the men own their own homes?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What are the housing conditions at McKeesport? Are the houses well kept and reasonably comfortable?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir; they are. The houses that the foreigners occupy now years ago the American iron workers used to occupy, and they have gradually got out from near the mill district and gone out further from the smoke and dirt; and the majority of the foreigners have taken those houses.

Senator PHIPPS. Since this strike was called, has there been any disturbance at McKeesport?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How was that caused, and what did it amount to?

Mr. LYNCH. About two weeks before the strike was called the mayor had issued orders for no public gatherings. They had had a meeting and they broke it up, and that night, during the night, there was a crowd of men accumulated down by the steel works—which I didn't see, but heard about it—and they went into the mills, stoned the mills, stoned some men, and also one of the foremen had his head cut open with a brick.

Senator PHIPPS. That was two weeks before the strike was called?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What was the purpose of that crowd in going to the mill and causing that disturbance? Was that an attempt to organize the men?

Mr. LYNCH. I could not say what the trouble would be, on account it was the intent to break up these meetings and not allow them to have public gatherings.

Senator PHIPPS. Since that time has there been any further disturbance?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir; none whatever, that I know of. I left Tuesday to come here; there had been no trouble up to then—no pickets out, nor nobody molesting anybody at all going to or coming from the mill, that I know of.

Senator PHIPPS. And no crowds congregated around the entrances, or anything of that sort?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. The public meetings have been stopped; prohibited by order of the mayor?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do the strikers hold meetings elsewhere on private lots or in halls?

Mr. LYNCH. Well, they was holding them in halls, but he stopped them holding meetings in halls.

Senator PHIPPS. He stopped them from holding meetings in halls?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir; he did not allow any meetings or any public gatherings of any kind.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that action on the part of the mayor, or the Burgess; did that action meet with the approval of the citizens of McKeesport?

Mr. LYNCH. I believe so.

Senator STERLING. They prevented all public meetings?

Mr. LYNCH. All public meetings. No meetings of any kind whatever.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of any attempt at your plant to prevent the organization of union men?

Mr. LYNCH. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Has there been any discrimination, that you know of, by the company officials against the union men?

Mr. LYNCH. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further from this witness?

Senator WALSH. I have a letter sent to me from Pennsylvania this morning, which I think I will read to the committee. It may have some bearing. I will ask permission not to mention the name or place until I learn from the author whether he is willing to have his name in the record. The letter is as follows:

HON. SENATOR WALSH.

MY DEAR SIR: The H. C. Frick Coke Co., a subsidiary of the United States Co., operates coal mines and coke works in this region. President Gary made assertions about open shops and good working conditions in their coal and coke business. I am so situated that I know some of the conditions.

1. The coal and coke business is worked by the corporation absolutely non-union. If a man is discovered to be a member of the union he is dropped. Hence, from the corporation and this industry is a closed shop to the union men.

2. The men get \$1.30 for loading in the mines and mining one mine car. This carload of coal is not weighed to 110 bushels. The union mines have their own weighmaster, but the Frick mines do not allow anything but the orders of the boss. It takes a very strong man to turn out four of these carloads a day of 10 hours, and he must overwork himself to do it.

3. The men get 99 cents to load machine cut coal, and the carload is regulated in the above manner. A horse of a man can turn out seven of these loads by desperate work. The company sometimes publishes reports of some men who make \$15 a day loading coal for the Frick Co. Here is how it is done in exceptional cases, and it is so regulated for publicity purposes. A number of men may be working in a difficult part of a mine for three months and make small wages and subject to great danger, then they come to a condition of work where everything is cleaned up, and they expect a harvest. They are at once moved to another section, and some young huskies are placed in the easiest spot, and for a week or two they make as much as \$15 a day. This high pay is advertised everywhere by the company to show that a man, if he exerts himself, can make a fortune under the company's régime. It is merely a fiction. Many a man has been shipped to get the result for advertising purposes.

Remedy: The United States should appoint inspectors who can not be bribed, and compel the company to give the wages for a load of 60 bushels or prosecute the managers for compelling the men to load 90 or 110 bushels for the price of 60 bushels.

Senator PHIPPS. Is the author a clergyman?

Senator WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is in that neighborhood?

Senator WALSH. It says in this line here: "In this region."

Senator STERLING. Where is the H. C. Frick Coal Co. plant?

Senator PHIPPS. All through the Connellsville district.

Senator WALSH. I will ask his permission to have his name in the record.

Senator PHIPPS. In that connection I have a report of an address, or sermon, delivered by a minister of the Roman Catholic Church, of Braddock, on September 21. These extracts are published by the Employers' Association of Pittsburgh, and as it was a public address I do not think it necessary to ask the author's permission to insert it in the record here:

STRIKE OF THE STEEL AND IRON WORKERS.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1919.

*To the members of the Employers' Association of Pittsburgh.*

GENTLEMEN: Rev. P. Molyneux, pastor of the St. Brendans Roman Catholic Church at Braddock, delivered to his congregation a sermon on Sunday, September 21, of which the following are excerpts:

"I wish to call your attention to a matter of vital importance to this community, namely, this threatened strike which outsiders are coming in here to bring about. This strike is not being brought about by intelligent or English-speaking workmen, but by men who have no interest in the community, are not an element of our community, and who do not have the welfare of our men at heart.

"I want you in the first place, to understand that I hold no brief for any mill or any trust of any company. I am here to speak of this strike so far as it concerns your moral welfare and interests. That is my duty and the obligation placed upon me as your guide in spiritual matters.

Within the last two weeks I have talked to at least 200 men with regard to this threatened strike—all intelligent, English-speaking workmen, some from my own parish and some outside, and I could not find one instance among these 200 men where the men wanted to go on strike. They all stated positively and clearly, on the other hand, that they were well treated and satisfied with conditions.

"There is one thing I have noticed about these strike leaders, as I suppose most of you have, and that is—with very few exceptions, if any at all—that never a one of them ever had on a workman's blouse in his life—never went into a mill in a pair of overalls—these men were never seen with the honest sweat of toil on their brows. The tan of brawn is not on their hands. They are a lot of smooth, oily-tongued talkers with a kind of sympathetic whine appealing to you. They are royal gentlemen of leisure; they always wear fine clothes.

"A strike should be the last resort for redress of a grievance, and all other means should be exhausted before men resort to a strike. A strike is a very serious thing and entails very serious consequences on the family and the home. Most of you remember the Homestead strike in 1892, and you know and realize that the effect of that strike is still felt in this community.

"These fellows—strike leaders—hoodlums, that try to keep you from work, live on the bread earned by other people. They don't want to work themselves. They will tell you these mills ought to belong to you. Tell them they do! Some of them say the mills ought to be driven out. Drive them out and what will you have? Weeds, stones, rattlesnakes, waste, and desolation."

Inasmuch as the foregoing remarks did not emanate from the management of the steel corporations but from a disinterested,

prominent citizen, interested only in the general welfare of the community and in the reign of law and order, we believe his remarks are of sufficient importance to present them to you for your consideration.

Yours, very truly,

THE EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH, •  
WM. FREW LONG,  
*Vice President and General Manager.*

Senator STERLING. What is the industry there, Senator?

Senator WALSH. It is buried. Of course the big plant is the Thompson Steel Rail Mill, and then the wire mills—there are a great many different mills around in that locality, some belonging to the Steel Corporation and others belonging to independents.

**STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN A. HICKEY, OF HOMESTEAD, PA.**

The CHAIRMAN. You work in the Homestead mill, do you, Mr. Hickey?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your job?

Mr. HICKEY. Bottom maker in soaking pits.

The CHAIRMAN. How much do you earn per day?

Mr. HICKEY. About \$14 per day.

The CHAIRMAN. How many days do you work in the week?

Mr. HICKEY. Six.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours a day?

Mr. HICKEY. I work 10½ daylight, day turn, 13½ night turn.

The CHAIRMAN. When you come to the end of your 10½ day shift, then you work right straight through in the night?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you work that?

Mr. HICKEY. We have two turns.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there complaint in the mills about these long hours of service?

Mr. HICKEY. Well, there has not been any that I know of; no, no complaint whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you like these long hours?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir; we would be satisfied with shorter hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any complaint about wages in the mills?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are out on a strike at your mill?

Mr. HICKEY. I would judge about 3,000, or around there.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of those are what have been termed foreigners here in this hearing?

Mr. HICKEY. They are practically all of them, with the exception of a very few.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you talked with them about their grievances?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not paid much attention to it?

Mr. HICKEY. I worked with them; however, the American employees do not understand them.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of the American employees are out on strike at your mill?

Mr. HICKEY. I would not say in the whole plant of the Homestead Steel Works that there are 50.

The CHAIRMAN. About 50 in the whole works?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a stockholder in the company?

Mr. HICKEY. Well, yes; more or less.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is it, how many shares do you have?

Mr. HICKEY. I have \$1,500 or \$1,600 worth of shares.

The CHAIRMAN. That is common stock?

Mr. HICKEY. Both.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got it paid for?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is good. Could you tell us anything in addition to what these other three gentlemen this morning have told us about conditions?

Mr. HICKEY. My statement would be almost similar to the statements that were made by them.

The CHAIRMAN. You can not add anything to what they have told us?

Mr. HICKEY. No; I could not add a great deal, any more than the houses that the company are building and has built and rented to employees are up-to-date in every respect.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you own your own home?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you buy it from the company or through the assistance of the company?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You did not have to borrow from the company in order to get it?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You confirmed the statements of the recent witnesses as to the manner in which workmen are enabled to build their houses where they have—

Mr. HICKEY (interposing). Yes, sir; I would confirm that same statement.

Senator STERLING. Do you agree with the statement made by the other witnesses that you have the 8-hour basis day?

Mr. HICKEY. I would feel inclined that way.

Senator STERLING. There is pay and a half for overtime, is there?

Mr. HICKEY. There is now.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been employed at Homestead?

Mr. HICKEY. Thirty-one years.

Senator STERLING. What is your particular job. You may have stated it, but I do not recall?

Mr. HICKEY. Bottom maker in soaking pit.

Senator STERLING. Do you have any men under you?

Mr. HICKEY. Well, a few. There is quite a number of us works together.

Senator STERLING. How many in a crew are working together?

Mr. HICKEY. About 11 or 12.

Senator STERLING. Are any of those foreigners?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. They are all Americans, are they?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Are there any union men in your plant?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir; I would state there is always union men in the Homestead Steel Works.

Senator STERLING. Have you known of any attempt to prevent the organization of union men in your plant?

Mr. HICKEY. There is no attempt made in the mill.

Senator STERLING. Have you known of any discrimination by the officials against the union men?

Mr. HICKEY. None whatever.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of any discharges of men because they were union men?

Mr. HICKEY. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. When a man applies for admission, is he compelled to fill out a card stating whether or not he belongs to any union?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When he applies for a job?

Mr. HICKEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you sure about that?

Mr. HICKEY. It is a fact.

Senator PHIPPS. You have stated that about 3,000 men went out on strike. Do you know about the total number employed at the Homestead plant?

Mr. HICKEY. Between 8,000 and 9,000 men.

Senator PHIPPS. What would be your estimate as to the division between Americans and foreigners, or how many foreigners are included in that 8,000 or 9,000?

Mr. HICKEY. Why, I would figure on that probably between 25 and 30 per cent foreigners.

Senator PHIPPS. In the plant, do you know about what proportion would be classed as skilled workers and what percentage are unskilled or common laborers?

Mr. HICKEY. To the best of my knowledge on that, would be that the general labor is considered—

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; general labor?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes; about 2,000 general labor.

Senator PHIPPS. Most of that general labor are what, foreigners and Americans?

Mr. HICKEY. Well, they are mixed, but mostly foreigners.

Senator PHIPPS. About what do they earn per day, do you know?

Mr. HICKEY. About \$4.60, ten hours.

Senator PHIPPS. Would that be the lowest pay or the average?

Mr. HICKEY. That is the lowest rate paid.

Senator PHIPPS. The lowest?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do many of those 2,000 receive a higher rate by reason of having special duties, such as work in connection with the hot metal?

Mr. HICKEY. They receive more money according to the hours of work.

Senator PHIPPS. I wanted to know if there was a different hourly rate for special jobs that could be handled by unskilled men?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, sir; there is a different hour rate.

Senator PHIPPS. About how high does that run?

Mr. HICKEY. I know of men that are working day work that are getting 53 cents an hour.

Senator PHIPPS. They do not require any particular training or education to hold those jobs, do they?

Mr. HICKEY. No; they do not have to be experienced.

Senator PHIPPS. Any good workman can come in off the street and fill that position?

Mr. HICKEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Hickey.

Mr. HICKEY. Senators, I would like to extend to you gentlemen an invitation to come to the Homestead Steel Works and view the situation from your own observation in regard to the conditions that exist at the Homestead Steel Works.

The CHAIRMAN. The ballot used in voting I think should be placed in the record. It has been presented to me as one of the ballots. Also the bulletins referred to yesterday by Mr. Foster, I think, or by some other witness, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, I think should also go in the record.

Also a notice about the election of delegates to the national conference which may be of interest, and which will be placed in the record.

(The matter referred to is here printed in full, as follows:)

## BALLOT

### IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

The union committees are now working to get higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions from the steel companies. Are you willing to back them up to the extent of stopping work should the companies refuse to concede these demands?

Mark X in square indicating how you vote.

YES ☐

NO ☐

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ORGANIZING IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

WM. Z. FOSTER, *Secretary-Treasurer*,

303 Magee Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

### IRON AND STEEL WORKERS BULLETIN No. 1.

[Published by National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers. Samuel Gompers, chairman, Washington, D. C.; William Z. Foster, secretary-treasurer, 303 Magee Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. Pittsburgh, Pa., June 14, 1919.]

### ATTENTION! READ THIS IMPORTANT BULLETIN.

On Sunday, May 25, in Pittsburgh, a national conference was held of representatives of steel workers' unions from all over the United States, which have been built up as a result of the big campaign of the American Federation of Labor to organize the steel industry. Over 650 delegates were present. They came from every great steel mill in the country. They represented every trade in the industry, 24 in all.

At this conference the feeling was general that the work of organization has progressed to the point now where the steel workers in the big mills are justified in moving to establish trade-union conditions. Hence, a resolution was



unanimously adopted to the effect that a joint committee, representing all trades, proceed to arrange a conference with the United States Steel Corporation and the other big companies.

On May 27 the National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers, the body having the campaign work in charge, met in Washington, D. C., considered the above resolution, adopted it unanimously, and laid plans to form the committee that will present the claims of the workers to the steel companies. And there the matter rests at present.

These activities of the unions are of the utmost importance to every steel worker in America. For many years the men in this great industry have accepted whatever conditions were handed to them and have had nothing whatever to say in the matter. But now they are endeavoring to bring about a great change and to set up the principles of trade unionism. The movement they are developing promises to be one of the greatest ever known. Upon its outcome will depend the course industrial history will take for years to come, not only in the steel industry but in many others.

In this great movement what part are you taking? Are you standing aside and letting it go along, paying no attention to it, even though it has to do with your most vital interests, or are you playing the part of a man and taking an active interest in the work of organization?

It is now high time for every steel worker in America to get into the American Federation of Labor and to become a union man. Attend our meetings and get all your fellow workers to do the same. In order to get the necessary results from the effort now being made, it is absolutely essential that the mills be thoroughly organized. Therefore you should do your part to see that this organization is brought about.

From time to time these bulletins will be issued, informing you of what the unions are doing to improve conditions in the steel industry. Watch for their appearance. Read them carefully. Pass them around to your friends. Pay no attention to what you read in other sources about the steel campaign.

Now is the time for the steel workers to organize. Let every man worthy of the name take his place in the ranks of organized labor.

---

#### IRON AND STEEL WORKERS BULLETIN No. 2.

[Published by National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers. John Fitzpatrick, chairman, Chicago, Ill.; William Z. Foster, secretary-treasurer, 303 Magee Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. Pittsburgh, Pa., July 30, 1919.]

#### IMPORTANT! ATTENTION!

The following propositions, adopted by the National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers, at the meeting in Pittsburgh, July 20, 1919, will be presented to the big steel corporations as soon as conferences can be arranged between them and the unions. These propositions are general in character and are subject to development when the various organizations prepare their respective trade demands.

1. Right of collective bargaining.
2. Reinstatement of all men discharged for union activities, with pay for time lost.
3. The eight-hour day.
4. One day's rest in seven.
5. Abolition of 24-hour shifts.
6. Increases in wages sufficient to guarantee American standards of living.
7. Standard scales of wages for all crafts and classifications of workers.
8. Double rates of pay for all overtime work and for work on Sundays and holidays.
9. Check-off system of collecting union dues and assessments.
10. Principles of seniority to apply in maintaining, reducing, and increasing working forces.
11. Abolition of company unions.
12. Abolition of physical examination of applicants for employment.

When in force, these reforms will make the steel industry one of the best in the country to work in. To achieve them will require the cooperation of every iron and steel worker. Be a man and do your part. Join the American Federation of Labor at once, and get all your fellow workers to do likewise.

## IRON AND STEEL WORKERS' BULLETIN No. 3.

[Published by National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers; John Fitzpatrick, chairman, Chicago, Ill.; William Z. Foster, secretary-treasurer, 303 Magee Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa., September 10, 1919.]

STRIKE, SEPTEMBER 22, 1919.

The workers in the iron and steel mills and blast furnaces, not working under union agreements, are requested not to go to work on September 22, and to refuse to resume their employment until such time as the demands of the organizations have been conceded by the steel corporations.

The union committees have tried to arrange conferences with the heads of the steel companies in order that they might present our legitimate demands for the right of collective bargaining, higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions. But the employers have steadfastly refused to meet them. It therefore becomes our duty to support the committee's claims, in accordance with the practically unanimous strike vote, by refusing to work in the mills on or after September 22, until such time as our just demands have been granted. And in our stoppage of work let there be no violence. The American Federation of Labor has won all its great progress by peaceful and legal methods.

*Iron and steel workers:* A historic decision confronts us. If we will but stand together now like men our demands will soon be granted and a golden era of prosperity will open for us in the steel industry. But if we falter and fail to act this great effort will be lost, and we will sink back into a miserable and hopeless serfdom. The welfare of our wives and children is at stake. Now is the time to insist upon our rights as human beings.

Stop work September 22.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ORGANIZING IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

---

*Awake! Organize!*

IRON AND STEEL WORKERS ELECT YOUR DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF ALL IRON AND STEEL WORKERS' UNIONS TO BE HELD SUNDAY, MAY 25, AT 10 A. M. IN THE UNION LABOR TEMPLE, WASHINGTON AND WEBSTER AVENUES, PITTSBURGH, PA.

This great conference is being called under the auspices of the national committee for organizing iron and steel workers. Its purpose is to devise ways and means to complete the organization of the workers in the mills so that they can reap the benefits of unionism in the way of higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions.

The miners, railroad men, building tradesmen, packing-house employees, shipyard workers, garment workers, printing tradesmen, and many other classes of workers are strongly organized and are enjoying good conditions. While the mill workers are trembling in fear of wage reductions these united workers are continually marching ahead to better conditions. It is high time that the iron and steel workers followed their example by completing their organization.

The national conference of May 25 will be one of the most important gatherings of working men ever held on the American continent. It will mark an epoch in the industrial history of this country. Delegates will be present from the great steel mills at Gary, Bethlehem, Steelton, Birmingham, Pittsburgh, Homestead, Youngstown, Cleveland, South Chicago, Joliet, Indiana Harbor, Pueblo, Duluth, McKeesport, Duquesne, Chicago, Johnstown, Coatesville, Nicetown, Buffalo, Lorain, Sharon, Butler, Leechburgh, Clairton, New Castle, Steubenville, Mingo, Wheeling, Bellaire, Milwaukee, Braddock, Rankin, Donora, Monessen, Charleroi, Peoria, and many other places.

President Gompers, Secretary Morrison, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, the presidents and secretaries of the 24 international unions cooperating in the great drive to organize the steel industry, and the members of the national committee for organizing iron and steel workers have all been invited to attend.

All unions of every trade regularly affiliated with their respective international unions and the American Federation of Labor having members employed

in iron, steel, and tin plants or having jurisdiction over men employed in these plants are invited and urged to send delegates. This includes blacksmiths; boiler makers; brick and clay workers; bricklayers; bridge and structural iron workers; coopers; electrical workers; foundry employees; iron, steel, and tin workers; machinists; mine, mill, and smelter workers; mine workers; molders; pattern makers; plumbers and steam fitters; quarry workers; railway carmen; seamen; sheet-metal workers; stitutionary firemen; steam and operating engineers; steam shovel and dredge men; switchmen, etc., working in the iron and steel industry proper.

All unions are entitled to two delegates apiece.

Now is the time for the iron and steel workers to get busy. Hurry up. Organize. Elect delegates to this historic conference. Don't fail to have your plant and town fully represented.

For further information apply to

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ORGANIZING IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to present for the record, from Mr. E. T. Weir, president of the Weirton Steel Co., at Weirton, W. Va., under date of September 27, 1919, giving a recital of conditions prevailing at the plant of his company and in the town of Weirton, together with two small extracts from the Gazette-Times, of Pittsburgh, dated September 27, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. Those may be inserted in the record.

WEIRTON STEEL Co.,

Weirton, W. Va., September 27, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Following up my recent letter relative to the existing steel strike: I am much interested in the work being done by the Senate committee that is investigating the trouble, and while so far they have only had the strikers' side of the case, I feel there is detailed information that should be given to them at this time.

For instance, take our particular case here, at Weirton, which is, as you know, only 5 miles removed from Steubenville, Ohio. We have been operating right along this week, and our own employees have been anxious and willing to work. There has been the most radical system of intimidation carried on against them that I have ever seen, and a great many of our men have been so frightened that they have even locked themselves in their houses. Men who are willing to go to work have been deterred by the tears of their wives and children. Houses have been visited at night and the families told that if the man of the house went to work, he would be killed and the house blown up. School children have been stopped on the street and told that if their fathers went to work that night they would be killed. While we have been trying to catch the parties who are doing this, yet it is hard to cover the whole district in such detail as would be necessary, and particularly as the work is usually done after night.

In addition to this, the principal threat has been that the strikers from Steubenville, Martins Ferry, and Bridgeport, all of which are in Ohio, will march over here in a body of 5,000 and compel the men in our mills to quit work. Sheriff Cooper, of this county, some days ago posted a proclamation prohibiting any parades, gatherings, meetings, etc., inasmuch as he realized the great danger in the situation. Gov. Cornwell has taken the matter up with Gov. Cox, of Ohio, as you will see from the inclosed paper and which is rather descriptive. It shows that, in the face of this, these people expect to come over here and Wilson, the head of the strike committee in Steubenville, states that "no power can stop them." In other words, constituted legal authority in West Virginia means nothing to this radical leader, who is without question of the Foster type, and which class is unfortunately directing the activities in this strike.

The point in connection with this that I think is so important to be brought out is this: We have in Weirton 4,000 men working and who have taken no part in this strike. They are happy and contented, satisfied with their wages and working conditions. This must be the reason for their continuing to work, because there has been no attempt on our part to compel them. I have talked with a great number of the men myself and made it clear to them that

they are free agents and that it never was our disposition to coerce them in any way at any time. Personally, I do not believe that coercion ever produces satisfactory results, and I believe that our success in dealing with our labor has been because we make them understand that they are free agents at all times.

What right has any individual or class of individuals, who come out on a strike, to go into a peaceful community and prevent its men, who are satisfied with their conditions, from working? It seems to me that this is a point that should be brought out very forcibly in this Senate investigation. The people in the country should be given to understand that they are free agents. The man who wants to quit work has a perfect right to do that, but at the same time the man who wants to continue to work has an equal right to his own decision.

Never in the history of our country has there been such a wholesale attempt at intimidation; and this is because the strike was first called by radical Bolsheviks, and also because it is being carried on strictly under their tactics.

I see that Mr. Gompers, on the stand yesterday, stated that Foster was originally very radical, but that he has now changed. My dear Senator, you are just as familiar with this class of agitator as I am, and you know that the older they grow the worse they become and that there is never any change for the better in their sentiments. Once an anarchist, always an anarchist. I think this apology, on the part of Gompers for Foster, after stating that he (Gompers) was opposed to the calling of the strike, shows that the old man has lost his grip and that the American Federation of Labor is in the hands of the extremely radical element.

The testimony of Fitzpatrick the first day of the investigation is enlightening. Notwithstanding the fact that he is one of the fellows who insist on being able to represent the workers and stand between them and their employers, he admits never having been in a steel plant; he knows nothing of the various jobs, nothing of the wages they are being paid, nor the hours they work, and yet stands up and says that the wages are "pauper wages," etc. You can realize that if manufacturers had to deal with fellows like this they might as well shut up their plants permanently. Foster is the same kind. He is a printer, I think, by trade and admits knowing absolutely nothing about the steel business.

The main issue is being constantly beclouded by the labor leaders. They claim continually that the men are not able to deal collectively with the employers and that they must have outside representatives. The facts are that the steel manufacturers will deal always with their own employees, individually or collectively. This is the case with us, and every man that works for us realizes that. I think every manufacturer has a strong desire to have his employees call and present any grievance that may exist, so that it may be gone into and remedied.

I have written you at some length because I think you are interested in these facts, and I wondered if you would not confer with Senator Phipps, who is on the Senate committee, and who is to a great extent familiar with the steel industry, and I feel sure greatly interested in the above facts, and particularly those that are conveyed through the inclosed newspaper clipping, showing the disregard of existing law and the intention to intimidate.

Appreciating your interest in the matter, believe me,

Very truly, yours,

E. T. WEIR, *President.*

HON. HOWARD SUTHERLAND,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

---

[From Gazette Times, Pittsburgh, Pa., Sept. 27, 1919.]

MARCH ACROSS LINE VOTED BY MEN TO CLOSE WEIRTON MILLS—SHERIFF TOLD TO ACT TO BLOCK THREATENED PARADE OF STEUBENVILLE STRIKERS, DECIDED IF WORKERS DO NOT QUIT BEFORE MONDAY—6,000 MEN AT MEETING AGREE TO AID IN FORCING WALKOUT—MOVE ATTACK ON STATE RIGHTS, WEST VIRGINIA EXECUTIVE SAYS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *September 26.*

Upon receipt to-day of a telegram from Gov. Cornwell, of West Virginia, to the effect that 5,000 men from Steubenville and other Ohio towns near by

are reported to be planning to cross the Ohio line into Hancock County, W. Va., to compel workers to quit their places, Gov. Cox to-day wired W. G. Baker, sheriff of Jefferson County, to use his best offices in order to prevent any possibility of conflict between citizens of Ohio and West Virginia.

In his telegram to Gov. Cox, Gov. Cornwell said such an invasion of West Virginia by Ohio strikers "will be regarded as an attack upon the sovereignty of West Virginia."

SHERIFF WARNED OF MOVE.

"I have no means of knowing whether the delegation in question contemplates anything which would be a violation of the laws of Ohio," said Gov. Cox in his telegram to Sheriff Baker, "but I respectfully urge upon you to use your best offices in order to avoid any possibility of conflict between the citizens of this Commonwealth and the State Government of West Virginia."

The governor called upon Sheriff Baker to keep him advised of the developments.

MARCH DECIDED AT MEETING.

STUEBENVILLE, OHIO, *September 26.*—(Special)—"If the Weirton Steel Co.'s plant at Weirton, W. Va., is in operation next Monday morning, between 6,000 and 8,000 strikers from the Steubenville district will march from this city to Weirton. I can't stop them; neither can anyone else. They are determined to go there."

This declaration was made to-night by Frank Wilson, secretary of the Steubenville district strike committee, at a meeting of 1,000 Weirton Co. employees, held in the court house here, at the request of the local strikers, with a view to persuading the Weirton men to strike. \* \* \* Preparations locally have been made to prevent the threatened march on Weirton. Up to the present the strikers' meetings and parades have not been molested.

Weirton is owned by the steel company and only employees of the plant reside there.

Employees of the Weirton Steel Co. are not organized and the plant is reported by company officials to be operating 100 per cent.

Weirton is said to be heavily guarded by deputies.

The strike situation here was quiet to-day.

There was talk to-day of a vote to be taken to-morrow at the Mingo plant of the Carnegie Steel Co., but this could not be confirmed at the mill office or strike headquarters. All of the Steubenville plants remain idle. Weirton is the only plant working in the district.

GOV. CORNWELL WARNS COX.

CHARLESTON, W. Va., *September 26.*—Upon being informed this afternoon that Gov. Cox of Ohio had taken action to prevent any invasion of West Virginia by armed steel strikers from Steubenville, Ohio, Gov. Cornwell gave out the text of his telegram to the Ohio governor, which is as follows:

"I am in receipt of the following telegram from the sheriff of Hancock County:

"From daily papers and other sources apparently reliable, strikers in Steubenville and other Ohio towns nearby are organizing a body of 5,000 men to parade to Weirton to get the men working in the mills there to quit work. I fear, if carried out, it would result in serious trouble possibly, as the parade would enter Hancock County by crossing the Ohio River, going through the north part of Brooke, crossing into Hancock. I feel that parade should be prevented if possible.

"I respectfully request that you investigate this situation and see that there is no invasion of this State by strikers from the Ohio side. Any such effort will be regarded as an attack upon the sovereignty of West Virginia."

Senator PHIPPS. I desire to offer also for insertion in the record resolutions adopted by a meeting of the employees of the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., which meeting was held at Atlantic City on August 23, and which has been referred to in this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Those may be received and placed in the record. That concludes the witnesses for to-day, and we will adjourn subject to the call of the chair.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., August 23, 1919.

After a two days' session, devoted to business of a diversified nature, the representatives of the workmen of the various plants of the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., Cambria Steel Co., which is controlled by the former company, and their subsidiaries, under the plan of collective bargaining in vogue in the plants of these companies, adjourned this afternoon.

The most important accomplishment of the meeting was the adoption of a resolution relating to lowering the cost of living. This resolution, which was unanimously adopted, resulted from discussion which took place at a meeting of the divisional representatives of the Cambria Steel Co., held at Johnstown, Pa., just previous to coming to Atlantic City. The question was proposed to the general meeting to-day by F. M. Mansfield, chairman of the Cambria committee, and the attached resolution resulted from the discussion.

The representatives are selected by the workmen in the various plants at regularly held elections, and their thoughts are therefore characteristic and representative of the thoughts and ideas of their fellow workmen.

The resolution was the product and idea of the man and its introduction and the action taken upon it was in no way influenced by the officials of the company.

Inasmuch as the committee's action is representative of the thoughts of approximately 30,000 employees of the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., it should, and no doubt will, have great weight with the authorities in determining their course and in meeting and solving the problem of the high living cost.

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EMPLOYEES OF MIDVALE STEEL AND ORDNANCE CO., CAMBRIA STEEL CO., AND SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES, ASSEMBLED IN CONFERENCE, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., AUGUST 23, 1919.**

Whereas the high cost of living needs to be abated by diligent, efficient, and conscientious labor, by thrift and the avoidance of waste and extravagance;

And whereas the price of commodities is regulated by the day's labor of a man and the real unit of value or the unit of compensation is not a dollar but the purchasing power of a dollar, and that the price of all things, meaning the average price of everything we use and consume, which is commonly referred to as the average price of commodities, is fixed, regulated, raised or lowered by the average compensation received for one hour's work by every man and every woman;

And whereas we believe the only sure remedy for the high cost of living is increased production and the stabilization of prices in conformity with wages now being paid;

And whereas we believe any workman who demands a greater proportionate return for his labor than his fellow workmen in other lines are getting is as guilty of profiteering as a grocer who charges exorbitant prices for the necessities of life, and that increases in wages paid to certain classes of workers by the Government or others will result in higher prices being set by the profiteers for the necessities of living to all purchasers alike: It is, therefore,

*Resolved*, That the persistent and unceasing demand of workmen employed in all classes and kinds of industries for a shorter day's work and an increased wage in order to meet the present high cost of living is uneconomic and unwise and should not be encouraged.

*Resolved further*, That private monopolies should be controlled and profits restricted to a rate that shall be fair to the consumer.

*Resolved further*, That unnecessary exports of food and clothing be restricted and that all stores of hoarded supplies be uncovered and placed in the open market.

*Resolved further*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Senators in Congress from Pennsylvania, and to the Congressmen of the various districts in which are located the various plants of the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., and to the State and municipal authorities, to the end that they may by all the powers and means to them available, endeavor to bring about normal conditions, with special privileges to none, but justice to all, and sure and swift retribution for those who may attempt to profiteer in the necessities of life.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY PLANT COMMITTEE OF EMPLOYEES, COATESVILLE WORKS,  
MIDVALE STEEL & ORDNANCE CO., SEPTEMBER 21, 1919.

Whereas the committee for organizing iron and steel workers in the United States has issued an order to the subordinate organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, directing its members to discontinue working at their usual occupations in the steel plants of the country, September 22, 1919;

And whereas a request has been made of employees who are not affiliated with the American Federation of Labor to act in sympathy with the members of the American Federation of Labor, and also remain away from their usual occupations on September 22, 1919;

And whereas the large majority of employees at Coatesville works have no desire whatever to sympathize with the members of the American Federation of Labor in this controversy, which they regard as extremely radical, and not in accord with their views, and desire to continue in their employment under present conditions, and await the readjustment of business conditions through normal channels;

And whereas the employees here have the right of collective bargaining and have had it for some time past, whereby their difficulties have been amicably adjusted in all cases, and are entirely of the opinion that the demands upon which the present controversy is based are not conducive of better conditions for the employee and employer;

And whereas the plant committee knows, by actual proof, that one of the men in direct charge of the present controversy has been in the past actively engaged in the promulgation of bolshevistic principles, which we of one accord condemn as absolutely unwise and un-American: It is therefore

*Resolved*, That we, the plant committee of Coatesville Works, will continue at our usual employment, and urge that all employees of this plant continue to do likewise.

And that we heartily condemn the action of the American Federation of Labor, firmly believing that the result of action as urged by them can result only in great hardship to the employee, who, having no source of revenue in the event of their orders being complied with, would, because of extraordinary living conditions, be speedily placed in misery and want, and with him his home and family would bear the brunt of the suffering caused by the aspirations of certain few who would profit thereby.

And, that we heartily condemn the strike as a means to an end, that want, misery, and in some cases death are the toll paid by the worker under this method of enforcing demands, and urge the adoption of the true American method of dealing in a peaceable and fair-minded manner, employing reason in all things and condemn violence, in any manner, shape, or form.

And that this resolution be placed before the employee and the public by the press, the pulpit, and as man to man, knowing full well that the result of radical action, now, as always, will react to the employees' disadvantage, and that conditions under continued peaceful operation of the plant will be infinitely better, and ultimately result in contentment and comfort of the employee and his family, as compared with hunger, cold, and all the well-known hardships the strike brings in its wake.

M. G. MUSSER,  
J. E. POWNALL,  
LEWIS F. BRANSON,  
FRANK B. DAVIS,  
GEORGE S. LYLE,

GEORGE E. LILlico,  
GEORGE N. SMITH,  
CHARLES E. NEAL,  
AUGUST T. MADDOCK,  
LEWIS WILSON,

*Plant Committee.*

(Thereupon, at 12.10 o'clock p. m., the hearing was adjourned subject to the call of the chairman.)









# INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR  
UNITED STATES SENATE

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

PURSUANT TO

### S. RES. 188

INSTRUCTING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE  
UNITED STATES SENATE TO INVESTIGATE THE STRIKE OF THE EM-  
PLOYEES OF THE STEEL MILLS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
AND SO FORTH

AND

### S. RES. 202

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, IN ITS  
INVESTIGATION OF THE STEEL STRIKE, TO HOLD HEARINGS, TO  
EMPLOY A STENOGRAPHER, TO REQUIRE THE ATTENDANCE OF  
WITNESSES AND THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS, DOCUMENTS, AND SO  
FORTH, AND PRESCRIBING PENALTIES FOR THE REFUSAL OF  
WITNESSES TO ATTEND OR ANSWER QUESTIONS

---

## PART 2

  


WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
1919



**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.**

**UNITED STATES SENATE.**

**WILLIAM S. KENYON, Iowa, *Chairman.***

**WILLIAM E. BORAH, Idaho.**

**CARROLL S. PAGE, Vermont.**

**GEORGE P. McLEAN, Connecticut.**

**THOMAS STERLING, South Dakota.**

**LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS, Colorado.**

**HOKE SMITH, Georgia.**

**ANDRIEUS A. JONES, New Mexico.**

**KENNETH D. McKELLAR, Tennessee.**

**JOSIAH O. WOLCOTT, Delaware.**

**DAVID I. WALSH, Massachusetts.**

**ROY H. RANKIN, *Clerk.***

**II**

## LIST OF WITNESSES.

---

	Page.
J. S. Oursler.....	477
George Brumbah.....	485
John Anderson.....	486
John Anderson.....	487
Joseph Fish.....	488
LaClair Rusha.....	489
John Zak.....	490
W. M. Mink.....	490
John S. James.....	491
W. R. Clark.....	492
George S. Shipley.....	492
S. Barpek.....	494
Steve Bohannock.....	495
Andy Beckel.....	496
Mrs. Pentek.....	497
Sver Kabonski.....	498
John Powell.....	499
John Malcolm.....	500
<b>Andy Tomsek.....</b>	<b>500</b>
A. F. Diehl.....	501
Dr. L. H. Bodkin.....	507
H. J. Davis.....	512
I. J. Simmons.....	522
George Mikulvich.....	523
George Miller.....	524
Frank Smith.....	526
P. H. Grogan.....	527
William A. Cornelius.....	528
William Feeney.....	533
Adelbert Kazlncy.....	542
P. H. Brogan.....	548
E. V. Babcock.....	561
Mrs. Mary Dolinsky.....	564
Mary Wichkowicz.....	568
Lurgi Sidella.....	569
Andrew Pastor.....	573
W. N. McNair.....	575
William J. Burke.....	581
H. F. Lilley.....	583
C. W. Sypniewski.....	587
Jacob Roe.....	597
Andrew Pido.....	598
Mike Mestrovich.....	603
J. G. Brown.....	607
Isaac M. Scott.....	631
Matt O'Reilly.....	672
Peter P. Walsh.....	681
James Lloyd.....	692
C. A. Lighthill.....	695
<b>Andy Barillo.....</b>	<b>698</b>
John Bulocko.....	699
John Dontrick.....	705
August Mann.....	709
Michael J. O'Donnell.....	722
Joe Kerspfnach.....	725
George F. Colson.....	728
Mrs. Annie Banks.....	735
John Yillawich.....	742

	Page.
Bon Ponovitch .....	745
Elmer Kusock .....	747
George Wakale .....	753
Andy Plevel .....	758
Mrs. Anna Kachmarik .....	761
John Brada .....	764
Rudolph Dressel .....	768
J. L. Beachen .....	772
Frank Gainer .....	779
George Gausney .....	783
Ero Supinen .....	785
George F. Colson .....	788
Mary Kropick .....	789
Capt. William B. Hunter .....	793
C. L. Shuck .....	796
J. D. White .....	804
A. E. Thomas .....	806
H. F. Obert .....	805
A. J. Brennan .....	809
Mr. C. Yajapiz .....	815
Mr. Jacob Margolis .....	817
Lieut. Donald C. Van Buren .....	906
Mr. Oscar Edward Anderson .....	952
William J. Rallenbury .....	963
William S. Haddock .....	998
David Williams .....	1007
L. W. McNamee .....	1035
S. E. Wilson .....	1046

## INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Homestead, Pa.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States met, pursuant to the call of the chairman, at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., at 9.30 o'clock a. m., and proceeded from there in automobiles to Homestead, Pa., at the offices of the Homestead Steel Works.

Present: Senator Kenyon (chairman), Phipps, Sterling, and McKellar.

Also present: J. S. Oursler, general manager of the Homestead Steel Works.

### STATEMENT OF MR. J. S. OURSLER, GENERAL MANAGER OF THE HOMESTEAD STEEL WORKS.

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is J. S. Oursler, and you are general manager of the Homestead Steel Works?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is the total number of employees here?

Mr. OURSLER. The total number of employees is 11,500.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many out of that total are now at work?

Mr. OURSLER. Nine thousand and forty-four.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the Homestead Steel Works?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir; this is the Homestead Steel Works.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many did you say you have employed?

Mr. OURSLER. Eleven thousand five hundred, of which about 5 or 10 per cent are floaters, who are on the pay roll and not working.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of the number employed are foreigners?

Mr. OURSLER. We have 40 per cent Americans, 9 per cent colored.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you call the colored men Americans?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. And of the 25 per cent of your employees who are on strike, what percentage of them are foreigners, would you say?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, I would say they are 99.9 per cent, I believe—do you mean working?

Senator McKELLAR. No; out on strike.

Mr. OURSLER. Ninety-nine and nine-tenths per cent are foreigners who are out on strike.

Senator McKELLAR. And to what different nations do they belong, or where did they come from?

The CHAIRMAN. How do you define foreigners; the men who are naturalized or unnaturalized; or do you mean the men who were born in foreign countries?

Mr. OURSLER. We call the unnaturalized foreigners.

Senator McKELLAR. And those that have citizenship papers you do not class as foreigners, do you?

Mr. OURSLER. No; we call them Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. And 99 per cent of those who are out on strike are those you class as foreigners?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, 99 per cent of the 25 per cent that are out are foreigners?

Senator STERLING. Senator McKellar asked about the nationalities.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; what are the various nationalities?

Mr. OURSLER. My assistant here has gone to get that now. Here is a report as of September 1, and I have one compiled up to date.

Senator STERLING. We would much rather have the one up to date, if it would not be too much trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any violence from these people who are out on strike, Mr. Oursler? Has there been any violence at all?

Mr. OURSLER. I should say yes; we had a number of individual cases where a man was beaten up and of throwing bricks through a window, but we have not had any serious amount of violence.

Senator McKELLAR. Has anybody been killed here?

Mr. OURSLER. No; nobody has been killed.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there any definite organized effort at the present time to keep the men away from the plant?

Mr. OURSLER. No; not a great deal of it; just here and there is all. They did have the plants pretty well picketed, but that is practically over with and there is very little picketing to-day.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you allow them to hold their meetings?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there any curbing of their speech at all at those meetings?

Mr. OURSLER. They have to speak in English; that is all.

Senator STERLING. Do you think, Mr. Oursler, that there are men who are out who would be back if it were not because of some fear of injury they would receive if they come back?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; I think there are 70 per cent of the men who, I have no doubt, would be back if it were not for that fear.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the meetings where the English language is spoken; are they allowed to go on?

Mr. OURSLER. The sheriff stopped them from speaking in the foreign language about 10 days ago, I think it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there not a good many of those who can not speak the English language at all?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And how do they get along, Mr. Oursler, do you know?

Mr. OURSLER. No.



Senator PHIPPS. Oh, they must have their own interpreters.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you get along with them at the mills; that is, in the matter of issuing orders? Do you issue them in the different languages?

Mr. OURSLER. No; the majority of them can understand English enough to take an order.

Senator McKELLAR. What part of the 25 per cent which you say are out on strike is skilled labor?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, I would say that 60 per cent of it is common labor and the balance would be 30 per cent semiskilled labor.

The CHAIRMAN. And 10 per cent skilled labor?

Mr. OURSLER. And 10 per cent skilled labor.

Senator McKELLAR. And what are the wages that the skilled laborers receive?

Mr. OURSLER. The average earnings in the Homestead plant is \$6.91.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, take the 25 per cent that are out on strike, you say that 10 per cent are skilled and 30 per cent are semiskilled and 60 per cent unskilled? Is that correct?

Mr. OURSLER. That's it; yes, sir; that is correct.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, can you give us the average wage that is paid to each one of those classes?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, the common laborers earn 42 cents an hour for eight hours and time and a half for overtime. If they work 10 hours, they are paid for 11 hours, which would be \$4.62 a day.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there any complaint on account of the wages on the part of those who are out?

Mr. OURSLER. No.

Senator McKELLAR. And how do these men live? Do they own their own homes or do they rent?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, some of them have their own homes. We have quite a foreign population—Russian.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you have a good many Russians, have you?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir; we have 628 Russians.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they have lecturers and speakers to talk to them in their own language?

Mr. OURSLER. Why, I expect so; through their church.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they get much literature in their own language—Russian literature?

Mr. OURSLER. Why, I think that all the Russian literature in the United States is published in the United States—all of it published in the United States is Bolshevik, except one paper which is published by the Russian Catholic priest.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they get this Bolshevik literature that you speak of?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They do?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you notice that they have a tendency toward Bolshevism themselves?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is quite noticeable, is it?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. That is very distinct, is it?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And what percentage is Russian?

Mr. OURSLER. 4.28 per cent.

Senator STERLING. And is any of this Bolshevik literature published here, Mr. Oursler?

Mr. OURSLER. Not that we know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Why can not that stuff be stopped in the mails? Why do we keep letting that go through the mails?

Senator PHIPPS. Well, if we stopped it in the mails, they would send it by express.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how they get it, Mr. Oursler?

Mr. OURSLER. No; we do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You have never investigated that, have you?

Mr. OURSLER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that you folks should follow that up.

Senator STERLING. There is a portion of the bill—Senator Cummins's bill—two sections of which will apply directly to this literature.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you find that list?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; I have it here.

Senator McKELLAR. This list shows that of Americans there are 5,799, or 39.45 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Let that list go into the record at this point.

(The paper above referred to is here printed in full in the record, as follows:)

*Nationality report, Homestead Steel Works, Howard Axle Works, Carrie Furnaces, Oct. 8, 1919.*

Nationality.	Number.	Per-centage.	Nationality.	Number.	Per-centage.
American .....	5,799	39.45	Kreiner (Slovakian) .....	6	0.04
Armenian .....	15	.10	Lithuanian .....	238	1.62
Austrian .....	42	.29	Macedonian .....	4	.03
Arabian .....	5	.03	Mexican .....	130	.89
Albanian .....	25	.17	Negro:		
Austro-Servian .....	1	.01	American .....	1,734	11.80
Belgian .....	3	.02	British .....	1	.01
Bohemian .....	2	.01	East India .....	1	.01
Brazilian .....	1	.01	West India .....	1	.01
Bulgarian .....	67	.46	Norwegian .....	4	.03
Canadian .....	20	.14	Polish .....	432	2.94
Croatian (Horvat) .....	299	2.04	Portuguese .....	1	.01
Cuban .....	2	.01	Porto Rican .....	13	.12
Dalmatian .....	9	.06	Roumanian .....	49	.33
Danish .....	6	.04	Russian .....	628	4.26
English .....	424	2.80	Ruthenian .....	1	.01
Filipino .....	1	.01	Saxon .....	4	.03
Finnish .....	7	.05	Scotch .....	226	1.54
French .....	7	.05	Slovak .....	2,373	16.15
German .....	219	1.49	Servian .....	26	.18
Greek .....	267	1.82	Spanish .....	48	.33
Hebrew .....	11	.07	Swede .....	74	.50
Hindu .....	1	.01	Swiss .....	11	.07
Hollander .....	6	.04	Syrian .....	9	.06
Hungarian (Magyar) .....	574	3.91	Turk .....	53	.36
Indian .....	3	.02	Welsh .....	91	.62
Irish .....	443	3.02			
Italian .....	264	1.80	Total .....	14,687	100.0
Japanese .....	1	.01			

Mr. OURSLER. I have here a table showing the percentage of the normal force reporting at the Homestead Steel Works from Saturday, September 22, to October 9, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be printed in the record.

(The table above referred to is here printed in the record in full, as follows):

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Monday, Sept. 22-----	65.9	Wednesday, Oct. 1-----	68.4
Tuesday, Sept. 23-----	62.5	Thursday, Oct. 2-----	69.4
Wednesday, Sept. 24-----	62.1	Friday, Oct. 3-----	70.8
Thursday, Sept. 25-----	62.5	Saturday, Oct. 4-----	70.4
Friday, Sept. 26-----	64.7	Monday, Oct. 6-----	71.8
Saturday, Sept. 27-----	66.6	Tuesday, Oct. 7-----	73.2
Monday, Sept. 29-----	67.7	Wednesday, Oct. 8-----	74.7
Tuesday, Sept. 30-----	67.8	Thursday, Oct. 9-----	75.2

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any of the negroes out on this strike?

Mr. OURSLER. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. None at all?

Mr. OURSLER. Absolutely not, to a man.

Senator McKELLAR. I notice that the most of them are Slovaks and negroes, and then the Russians.

Senator STERLING. What proportion of those who are out on strike—of the 25 per cent of the employees now out on strike—are Slovak, do you suppose?

Mr. OURSLER. I think that possibly all of the Slovak are out on strike, and that this strike is a Slovak strike. I classify the Americans—any man that has taken out naturalization papers is classified as an American.

The CHAIRMAN. These men, according to your classification, the 99 per cent of these men who are out on strike, are foreigners under your designation of not being naturalized?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What about your turn-over on this class of labor, Mr. Oursler?

Mr. OURSLER. The turn-over on this class of labor, so far this year, is 575 a month. That is, in the men employed.

The CHAIRMAN. And does that run heavier among the foreigners than it does among the Americans?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you say that these Russians talk this doctrine of Bolshevism right around here?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, not 1 per cent of the men who are out know why this strike is called or what it is for.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did they go out? How did they come to go out?

Mr. OURSLER. I think perhaps the best way that I can answer that question is to repeat a conversation which occurred between one of our superintendents and one of his men. He met him and he said to him "What are you striking for?" The man answered "I am striking for a dollar an hour, eight hours work, no bosses, no superintendents."

The superintendent said to him "Well, you earn \$15 or \$16 a day. Is that not enough?" The answer was, "Oh, yes; but I want no

bosses; get on the street car, no buy a ticket—union car. Get on the railroad, no buy ticket—union car.”

“But Joe,” he was asked, “do you want the man who works around the shop, the laborer, to get a dollar an hour?” “Jesus Christ, no,” he said.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you suppose it is possible for us to get hold of one of those people and to set him down and to ask him why he is striking, what he is striking about, and so on?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, there are 2,500 men out at Homestead, but I do not know where to lay my hands on them.

The CHAIRMAN. Could not the police officers tell us? I would like to get hold of a man like that and ask him why he is striking. I would like to examine some of those fellows, and see just what they know about it. There seems to be no complaint about wages; are there any complaints about hours of service? Do they complain about 12 hours' work, or 10 hours' work?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; a large quantity of our labor wants to work eight hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Eight hours?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. And do they want the same pay—

Mr. OURSLER (interrupting). They want a considerable increase in pay.

The CHAIRMAN. They want an eight-hour day?

Mr. OURSLER. They want an eight-hour day.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your day now? How many hours?

Mr. OURSLER. We have 21.2 per cent of the men working eight hours, 25.9 per cent working 10 hours, 16.4 per cent working 11 hours, and 36 per cent working 12 hours.

Senator STERLING. Now, Mr. Oursler, you have the basic eight-hour day for all, have you not? That is, you pay time and a half for overtime; that is true, is it not?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And every man that works over eight hours in the mills is paid for overtime?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; he gets time and a half for overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you really have the eight-hour day—

Mr. OURSLER. So that we really have the eight-hour basic day—basic eight-hour day.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is what they want not to be permitted to get any overtime?

Mr. OURSLER. They want 8 hours a day and 11 hours pay for it.

The CHAIRMAN. They want an increase of pay?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, if they got that, would not they want to work overtime?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; plenty of them would. Our armor-plate department is an eight-hour department, and they have practically what the men in the mill would be satisfied with. They are on 8 hours and get 11 hours pay, and we have more men in proportion to the men employed out at the armor department than in any other department, notwithstanding that they have what the other men would like to have. We have more men out there.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any settlement of the town here that is distinctively foreign?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; the second ward.

The CHAIRMAN. The second ward?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; the second ward is foreign.

The CHAIRMAN. And a good many of the men live there, do they?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes; a very large part of the foreign population.

Senator McKELLAR. Does the company furnish houses for them?

Mr. OURSLER. We have built and under construction about 310 houses.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you rent those houses to the men?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And what does the company do, Mr. Oursler, in the way of providing educational facilities; that is, in the matter of encouraging the teaching of the English language among these people?

Mr. OURSLER. We have had either regular night classes carried on in all of these corporation towns, the towns where we have plants. The different foreign societies carry that work on to some extent. In fact, I have requests for assistance from the Russian Catholic Church, who want to start a work of that kind.

Senator STERLING. Well, the company assists in that, does it?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Does the company build school buildings?

Mr. OURSLER. No; we have not built any individual school buildings?

Senator McKELLAR. The State or city does that, does it not?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When you employ these men, do you make any effort to find out whether they have Bolshevik tendencies or not?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, we ask them a question, but you can not get any information out of them. We ask them that question. They absolutely close up as tight as a clam.

Senator McKELLAR. You have taken on all of these foreign laborers here, and from the figures you have given, the foreign element seems to predominate in the common labor. Would it have been possible to have gotten any Americans to take those places instead of these foreigners, or were you forced to take in the foreign element to have a supply of the common labor?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, a great many of the Americans come into the plants as common laborers, but they are ambitious and they do not wish to stay here long in that position as a common laborer. They want to go up.

The CHAIRMAN. And you can not get Americans to do this particular work that the foreigners are doing; is that so?

Mr. OURSLER. No, not to stay in that work.

Senator McKELLAR. But they do come in and get into the plant, and they come in with the idea of advancing?

Mr. OURSLER. They come in with the idea of advancing; yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And are the Negroes segregated, or are they just scattered about?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, they work all over the plant, all through the various departments.

Senator McKELLAR. And do they live all over the town also?

Mr. OURSLER. No, they mostly live down in the second ward, a large per cent of them live in the second ward, and a good many of them live in Pittsburgh.

Senator McKELLAR. They live in Pittsburgh and come out here to the work, do they?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Take that Squirrel Hill coming over here. While we were passing that I made a statement to Senator Sterling that undoubtedly lots of the Homestead employees, that is, the better paid men, the men who are earning the higher wages, live in those houses that we passed in coming over; is that so?

Mr. OURSLER. Yes, sir; that is right. We have some loans that we have made on the Squirrel Hill district for the employees, who have built up there.

Senator McKELLAR. Do many of the employees own stock in the company?

Mr. OURSLER. Our stock plan went into effect—since it went into effect, I mean the corporation, we have had 20,000 subscribers for a total of 43,000 shares.

Senator McKELLAR. And at a hundreds dollars each that would be \$4,300,000?

Mr. OURSLER. We had in 1919 3,518 subscribers for 10,389 shares, this year, January and February.

Senator STERLING. That is in the last year?

Mr. OURSLER. That is in the last year.

Senator McKELLAR. Does the company loan money to the employees?

The CHAIRMAN. They get a rebate of \$5 a year, do they not?

Senator McKELLAR. What is the amount of the capital stock of the corporation?

Mr. OURSLER. Well, I can not give you those figures.

Senator STERLING. Those figures are in the record already.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the Carnegie Steel Co. and the Homestead Steel Works the same thing?

Senator PHIPPS. The Homestead Steel Works is one of the plants of the Carnegie Steel Co. It has a lot of other plants.

The CHAIRMAN. But that is the only plant here.

Senator PHIPPS. It is a subsidiary of the United States Corporation. The United States Steel Corporation is really the holding company, but I do not believe any single plant is operated actively by the United States Steel Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. Could we get a glimpse into the mill?

Mr. OURSLER. I think we had better do that.

(Thereupon, at 10.30 o'clock a. m., the above-mentioned Senators made a trip through the mill, first visiting No. 4, open-hearth furnace.)

On the side of one of the houses was painted the following sign:

Fourth loan, \$2,263,300—\$177.43 per employee.

(The committee first visited the lavatory and locker room, where they were joined by the assistant superintendent, A. H. Watson.)

Mr. WATSON. This is the lavatory and locker room.

The CHAIRMAN. Can any of the men come in here?

Mr. WATSON. Well, only certain departments can have the use of the lockers. Any of the men, of course, can come in here, but only one department has the use of the lockers.

Senator STERLING. And you have lavatories for other departments?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir; we have lavatories for all of them.

(While going through open-hearth No. 2 mill, various workers were interrogated by the committee, they being taken from their work for that purpose, and apparently had no knowledge of the purpose for which they were interrogated.)

#### STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE BRUMBAH.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your name, my man?

Mr. BRUMBAH. George Brumbah.

Senator McKELLAR. And what is your nationality?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Armenian.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No; I have taken out my second papers.

Senator McKELLAR. You have just started to become naturalized?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. That is, you are going to become a naturalized citizen?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You want to be an American, do you?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And what do you get here?

Mr. BRUMBAH. I get between \$6 and \$7 a day.

Senator McKELLAR. And you are satisfied with your wages?

Mr. BRUMBAH. For this time, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. How much do you work?

Mr. BRUMBAH. I work 10 hours.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you get pay and a half for the two hours' overtime? Do you get pay and a half for overtime—eight hours?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you think this is a good plant?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, it is for me.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not want to work eight hours?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Sure, I want to get eight hours, but I want to make my money.

The CHAIRMAN. But do you want to get your overtime?

Senator STERLING. You get time and a half for overtime, do you?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What are your conditions at home? Have you good conditions there?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you have your family over here?

Mr. BRUMBAH. I ain't got no family over here. I am just with a woman.

Senator STERLING. Are you a married man?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. You have no family?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Nineteen years.

Senator STERLING. What is your business in Armenia?

Mr. BRUMBAH. I was a farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you speak English when you came here?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you not take out your papers before?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Well, I say I could not write very good.

Senator STERLING. You have learned to write now?

Mr. BRUMBAH. I can not write English.

Senator STERLING. You speak it pretty well.

Mr. BRUMBAH. No; not much.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you read any of the English papers?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What papers do you read?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are they printed? Are they printed in Armenia or are they printed in Cleveland?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they entirely in Armenian?

Mr. BRUMBAH. In Armenian.

Senator McKELLAR. What are these boys striking for?

Mr. BRUMBAH. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Has anybody come to you and asked you to join the union?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody has come to you and asked you to strike?

Mr. BRUMBAH. To strike; but I don't do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Has anybody tried to get you to strike?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they ever speak to you about it?

Mr. BRUMBAH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other Armenians here?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, sir; two.

The CHAIRMAN. Two Armenians?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are getting along pretty well, are you?

Mr. BRUMBAH. Yes; I am satisfied with it.

(At this point the committee was joined by Mr. Hayes, the superintendent of the department the committee was then in, open hearth furnace No. 2.)

#### STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN ANDERSON.

The CHAIRMAN. What country are you from?

Mr. ANDERSON. Ireland.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you born in Ireland?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. ANDERSON. I got the first papers, and I can get the second papers any time.

Senator McKELLAR. How long have you been here?

Mr. ANDERSON. Twenty-two years.

Senator McKELLAR. Why don't you get your naturalization papers out?



Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I should have gotten them out before, I know, but I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. What wages do you get?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I make about \$9.66 a hundred tons as it runs.

The CHAIRMAN. How much do you make—how much does that make you in one or two days?

Mr. ANDERSON. It runs about \$9 a ton.

The CHAIRMAN. And how much does that pay you per day, at \$9 a tons?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a day, I mean.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you make about \$9 a day?

Mr. ANDERSON. About that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you married?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Senator McKELLAR. What are these boys out here striking about?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is something I don't know. I have asked them about it, but I don't know.

Senator McKELLAR. Did they ever ask you to strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they ask you to join the union?

Mr. ANDERSON. The union, no, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you get any papers or circulars from them?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have there ever been any threats made against you?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not against me; I have not heard that there were.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know whether there were or not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not say; there were none against me.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are pretty well contented with things here, are you?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you work more than eight hours?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN ANDERSON.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. ANDERSON. John Anderson.

The CHAIRMAN. You are of the same name as the last man we talked to?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you Irish?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. What are you?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am Scotch.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am a helper in the open-hearth furnace.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long have you been here?

Mr. ANDERSON. Five years.

The CHAIRMAN. And what wages do you get?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I am paid about \$12 or \$14 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you married?

Mr. ANDERSON. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any children?

The CHAIRMAN. I have five children.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you own your own home?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not belong to the union, do you?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever belonged to the union?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they ever tried to have you join the union?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, they haven't spoke to me; they thought it was no use.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they threatened you if you did not join the union?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; nobody ever said union or anything to me.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours a day do you work?

Mr. ANDERSON. From 7 in the morning until 5.30 in the day time.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten hours and a half, is that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any time off?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we are busy all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that the men here are dissatisfied with their hours of work?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not think it.

The CHAIRMAN. The men seem to be pretty well satisfied.

Mr. ANDERSON. So far as I understand, they are satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men have gone out on strike, out of this plant?

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't know, sir. The laborers is mostly all that went out on this strike. I think that there is one first helper that went out of the plant; they are mostly laborers.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by laborers?

Mr. ANDERSON. The general labor all over the plant.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are getting about how much?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, 42 cents an hour for the first eight hours, and after that they get 63 cents an hour.

Senator PHIPPS. Are there many Americans out on strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think there is any Americans that is out on strike. There are none that I know of, English-speaking people.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a naturalized American, are you, Mr. Anderson?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. JOSEPH FISH.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your name?

Mr. FISH. Joseph Fish.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a native American?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. How many Americans are there out on strike?

Mr. FISH. Well, none that I know of, and only one that I heard of.

Senator McKELLAR. Only one?

Mr. FISH. One or two.

Senator McKELLAR. What percentage of the fellows out on strike are foreigners, do you know?

Mr. FISH. Well, they are mostly all foreigners on strike.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your position here?

Mr. FISH. Foreman.

Senator McKELLAR. How much do you make a day?

Mr. FISH. In the neighborhood of \$600 a month.

Senator McKELLAR. And are you satisfied?

Mr. FISH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Conditions are good, are they?

Mr. FISH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And your home conditions, are they good?

Mr. FISH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And all of the conditions of the men are good?

Mr. FISH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know what these boys are on strike for?

Mr. FISH. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Did they ever ask you to join the union?

Mr. FISH. No, sir.

(The committee then visited the lunch room in connection with open hearth No. 2 and inspected it.)

#### STATEMENT OF LA CLAIR RUSHA.

Senator McKELLAR. My boy, have you been in school?

Mr. RUSHA. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And how long have you been working out here?

Mr. RUSHA. Two weeks.

Senator McKELLAR. And how much do they pay you?

Mr. RUSHA. Twenty-three and one-half cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. And how long do you work?

Mr. RUSHA. Ten hours and a half—that is, daytime, and 13 night time.

Senator McKELLAR. How old are you?

Mr. RUSHA. Sixteen.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many boys are there about here?

Mr. RUSHA. Eight.

Senator McKELLAR. Eight boys?

Mr. RUSHA. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And are any of them any younger than you are?

Mr. RUSHA. I don't know.

Senator McKELLAR. And does your father work here in the mill?

Mr. RUSHA. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And are they good to you?

Mr. RUSHA. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You were born in this country, were you?

Mr. RUSHA. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And how much does your day's work bring you in?

Mr. RUSHA. \$2.95 a day.

**STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN ZAK.**

Senator McKELLAR. What is your name?

Mr. ZAK. John Zak.

Senator McKELLAR. And what is your nationality?

Mr. ZAK. Polish.

Senator McKELLAR. And how long have you been in this country?

Mr. ZAK. Twenty-one years.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a naturalized citizen?

Mr. ZAK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You have got your papers?

Mr. ZAK. Yes, sir; I got my papers about 16 years ago.

Senator McKELLAR. You not only wanted to be an American, but you are an American?

Mr. ZAK. Yes, sir; I married here in this country.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you a family here?

Mr. ZAK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What wages do you get? How much do you earn a day?

Mr. ZAK. Well, it runs from about \$10 to \$12 a day.

Senator McKELLAR. And what is your duty?

Mr. ZAK. Melter, steel melter.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you own your own home?

Mr. ZAK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What is it worth?

Mr. ZAK. It cost me \$2,400.

Senator McKELLAR. How many rooms have you in the house?

Mr. ZAK. Seven.

Senator McKELLAR. And how much of a family have you?

Mr. ZAK. Seven children.

Senator McKELLAR. You are a good man.

Senator PHIPPS. Did the company help you to buy the house?

Mr. ZAK. Well, I borrowed the money from the company and we paid them long ago.

Senator STERLING. What interest did you have to pay to the company?

Mr. ZAK. I paid 5 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you own any stock of the company, shares of stock?

Mr. ZAK. Yes, I own a couple of hundred of preferred stock.

Senator McKELLAR. Did anybody ask you to go on a strike?

Mr. ZAK. No.

Senator McKELLAR. What is the strike about?

Mr. ZAK. I don't know anything about it. I never asked, and nobody asked me to go. I do not know what it is about.

(The committee then proceeded in open hearth No. 2, 32-inch mill.)

**STATEMENT OF MR. W. M. MINK.**

Senator STERLING. What is your name?

Mr. MINK. W. M. Mink.

Senator McKELLAR. And what is your position?

Mr. MINK. I have charge of these mills here, of the 32, 72, 84, and 140.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, will you give us your view of what this strike is about?

Mr. MINK. We think it is entirely the Bolshevik spirit.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do you think that?

Mr. MINK. Well, because they were gathering up the aliens; they have been practically alien, in my opinion, very few American citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. They worked among the foreigners, do you say?

Mr. MINK. They worked among the foreigners entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. And most of the foreigners are out?

Mr. MINK. Most of the foreigners are out; 99 per cent of the foreigners that are striking here—that is, the strikers that are out are foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, does this Bolshevik tendency that you speak of, do they get any literature from any sources?

Mr. MINK. Will, we have not seen any literature, but only stuff like this, they say that if the mills are not running—we do not see this ourselves, but we get it from other sources—that they are going to get a dollar an hour and are going to get the best jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they going to man the mills themselves?

Mr. MINK. Yes, they are going to man the mills themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. And you really believe that there is a great deal of that Bolshevism about, do you?

Mr. MINK. Yes, I think there is. It is not a question of wages. They have never been getting more money than they have got, and the conditions are good.

The CHAIRMAN. How about their living conditions? How are they?

Mr. MINK. The living conditions are just what the men want. A lot of them have good jobs and they make good money, and they could live a whole lot better.

The CHAIRMAN. Do many of them own their own homes?

Mr. MINK. I could not tell you that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they send money home abroad?

Mr. MINK. I could not tell you that.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if you folks could tell us about their sending money home?

Mr. MINK. Yes; I am told—a bank down there can tell you, the Monongahela Trust Co. They run a foreign department and they would be in a better position to tell you, to give you that information.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN S. JAMES.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your name?

Mr. JAMES. John S. James.

Senator McKELLAR. And are you an American, Mr. James?

Mr. JAMES. Yes, sir; I have been here for 32 years.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. JAMES. Oh, my, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you been asked to join this strike?

Mr. JAMES. No.

Senator McKELLAR. Have any of the boys been asked to join the strike?

Mr. JAMES. They never asked anybody about the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not belong to the union and they do not and never have?

Mr. JAMES. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the strike about?

Mr. JAMES. That is what we want to find out.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they say it is about, men that have gone out?

Mr. JAMES. Well, I can not talk to them fellows. The main thing they want is that they want eight hours. They want eight hours.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the complaints, they want eight hours?

Mr. JAMES. Yes, sir; they want eight hours. They are striking for eight hours. That is all I can understand of it. They want eight hours. That is all I can understand, the fellows around the plant.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. W. R. CLARK.

The CHAIRMAN. You are working here now, are you?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. CLARK. W. R. Clark.

The CHAIRMAN. What are you doing?

Mr. CLARK. I am a roller.

The CHAIRMAN. How much are you making a month?

Mr. CLARK. I make about \$220 a month. It fluctuates, you know.

The CHAIRMAN. And there are no Americans out on strike?

Mr. CLARK. Very few of them, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. And does the complaint seem to be the long hours of work?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir; that is the real complaint.

(The Committee then left the Homestead Works and went down into the town of Homestead to interview strikers. At the corner of Dixon and Fifth Streets a number of men were congregated, and the Committee stopped and questioned them.)

The CHAIRMAN. Are you one of the strikers?

Mr. SHIPLEY. (No response.)

Senator McKELLAR. We do not want you to answer unless you wish to do so. We are here in the interest of fair play; that is all. We are members of the Senate investigating committee, and we are here in the interest of you as well as of the other side. We are only looking for fair play.

Will you state your name?

Mr. SHIPLEY. George S. Shipley.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE S. SHIPLEY.

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is George S. Shipley?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American, Mr. Shipley?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Well, I was in the Army; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a naturalized American?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

Mr. SHIPLEY. I am 35 years old. I am not a naturalized American. I was only 5 years old when I come here. I did not have to be. I am 31 years old.

Senator McKELLAR. And how long have you been here, Mr. Shipley?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Twenty-six years.

Senator McKELLAR. How long have you been working for the Homestead shops?

Mr. SHIPLEY. I have been working for the Homestead shops ever since I was a little fellow.

Senator McKELLAR. How old did you say you are?

Mr. SHIPLEY. I am 26 years old the 27th of this month.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, will you tell us just why you boys went on this strike?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Well, I did not make enough to keep a family. I have got a mother and I have a wife and I have a child, and they gave me 45 cents an hour; and, together with the high cost of living, I could not make enough to keep them. I could not make enough and live decent; and I live in a place that I would not want to live in if I could make enough money to get another place.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you mean that you make 45 cents an hour and time and a half for overtime?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Yes; I work 10 hours and get 11 hours' pay for it.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there many of the boys out on strike?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Sure.

Senator McKELLAR. What proportion of them are Americans and what proportion are foreigners? I mean of the men out on strike—what proportion are foreigners and what proportion are Americans?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Well, they are all—of course, I could not tell you that. Lots of them are foreigners and lots of them are Americans.

Senator McKELLAR. Lots of them are Americans and lots of them are foreigners?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the reason that you struck was because you could not make enough to live on?

Mr. SHIPLEY. I could not make enough, according to the high cost of living; did not make enough to pay my bills; and in case I got sick, then I would not have a cent in the house. I was in the hospital with pneumonia two or three months ago.

Senator McKELLAR. You were in the hospital?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you in the company's hospital?

Mr. SHIPLEY. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. The company did not take care of you?

Mr. SHIPLEY. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And did you go to your own hospital?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Yes; I went to my own hospital. I tried to get up in the morning one morning and I could not get up. I had been out in the rain, it was raining the night before, and when I tried to get up in the morning I could not get up. I had very bad pains in my side. My wife said to me, "You stay at home," and my mother said, "Get a doctor." I got a doctor and he told me that I had pleu-

ris. He did not want to tell me that I had pneumonia. He said that I had pleurisy. I was there in bed for nine days and I went to the hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other gentlemen here who would like to make statements, any of your friends who are out on the strike?

### STATEMENT OF MR. S. BARPEK.

Mr. BARPEK. I would like to make a statement:

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. BARPEK. Barpek.

The CHAIRMAN. What nationality are you?

Mr. BARPEK. I am Slavish by birth.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. BARPEK. I have been here all of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a naturalized citizen—you did not have to be naturalized?

Mr. BARPEK. No; I am not, I was born here; I did not have to be naturalized; I was born here.

The CHAIRMAN. Were your parents naturalized American citizens?

Mr. BARPEK. My father is.

Senator McKELLAR. Your father is?

Mr. BARPEK. Yes, sir; my father is.

Senator McKELLAR. And what salary did you get? What wages did you get?

Mr. BARPEK. I was getting 43 cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. That is, for eight hours a day?

Mr. BARPEK. No; for 10 hours and 14 hours.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you get overtime after eight hours' work?

Mr. BARPEK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You did not get overtime pay after eight hours?

Mr. BARPEK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you got straight pay for 43 cents an hour?

Mr. BARPEK. I got straight 43 cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. And you worked sometimes as long as 14 hours?

Mr. BARPEK. I worked sometimes as long as 14 hours.

Senator McKELLAR. And what particular part of the work did you perform? What was your business?

Mr. BARPEK. I was a narrow-gauge switchman.

Senator McKELLAR. So you struck. Would you just mind telling us what you went on strike for?

Mr. BARPEK. Well, I did not think it was enough money, 48 cents an hour, and the hours were too long, and I had no pleasures, I had no pleasure with my children, working 14 hours, and then I would sleep all day and go right to work when I got up the next day, the next night.

Senator McKELLAR. Oh, you worked at night, did you?

Mr. BARPEK. We worked at night, week about



Senator McKELLAR. Is there anything else that you would like to say?

Mr. BARPEK. No; there is nothing else.

Senator McKELLAR. How many boys are out on the strike, do you know?

Mr. BARPEK. Well, I could not tell you exactly, but there are a good bit.

Senator McKELLAR. About how big a proportion of them? Is there a good big proportion of them?

Mr. BARPEK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What sort of homes do you boys have (addressing a bystander), are you married?

The BYSTANDER. No; I am living with my father and my mother.

Senator McKELLAR. Does your father work for the company?

The BYSTANDER. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. He is in some other business?

The BYSTANDER. No; he works for a contractor.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of those who are out are foreigners, and how many are American?

Mr. BARPEK. I have no knowledge as to that; I have no idea.

Senator McKELLAR. It is hard to say, is it?

Mr. BARPEK. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Of course you belong to the union?

I do not know of anything else. I think that is all. If there is any one else who would like to say anything, we would be glad to hear from them.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. STEVE BOHANNOCK.

Mr. BOHANNOCK. I would like to make a statement.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your name?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. My name is Steve Bohannock.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American citizen, or what nationality?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. Yes; we are American.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a naturalized citizen?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. No; I have not got the papers yet.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. About 12 years. I am not going back to the old country any more.

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to be an American citizen?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. I would rather stay here, just the same like American. My wife is an American.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a family?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you strike? Can you tell us why you struck?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. How is that?

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us why you struck?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. I strike because I can't help the family with that business.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you get?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. Forty-two cents an hour. I got 42 cents an hour and I worked 14 and 15 hours day and night time. You have got

something like that. They say, "If you don't do that I will get you fired right away."

Senator McKELLAR. How long have you been working over there?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. About five years.

Senator McKELLAR. You have been five years with this steel mill?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. Yes, sir; and I am fired three times for nothing. I can't help it if I can live on 42 cents. I can't live on 42 cents an hour, for my family and my wife and my children, and when they are sick I can't do anything, and she was sick in bed, and what have you got then?

Senator McKELLAR. Do you get overtime pay after eight hours?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. No; we don't get no overtime pay.

Senator McKELLAR. You did not get paid for overtime?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there anything else you would like to say, Mr. Bohannock?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. No; I don't care anything else to say. I am a poor man and I have got my family and I haven't got any money.

Senator McKELLAR. What sort of a home have you? Do you own your own home?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. No; I ain't got nothing.

Senator STERLING. You do not own your own home?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you have a wife and children?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. Yes, sir; I have a wife and two children.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone else that would like to be heard? How many of the boys are there on the strike? Do they allow you to meet and talk about the strike?

Mr. BOHANNOCK. No, sir; they don't allow us to stop on the streets at all. We have got to keep moving all the time.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. ANDY BECKEL.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. BECKEL. Andy Beckel.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a native of this country?

Mr. BECKEL. What do you mean, a native?

Senator McKELLAR. Were you born over here?

Mr. BECKEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And your father and mother are from what country?

Mr. BECKEL. Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember what country they came from?

Mr. BECKEL. Austria.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you strike? What was it that made you strike?

Mr. BECKEL. Well, I strike because we did not have the right conditions, and we were only paid 42 cents an hour, and we worked like a mule, and if you ever say anything to them they will discharge you, and you didn't have no word to say. We were never treated right while we were there.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you a family?

Mr. BECKEL. No; I live with my father and mother.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, gentlemen.

## STATEMENT OF MRS. PENTEK.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mrs. PENTEK. Mrs. Pentek.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are an Austria-Hungarian?

Mrs. PENTEK. I am a Hungarian.

The CHAIRMAN. And your husband is one of the men working in the mills?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your experience about anybody coming to you and asking you not to allow him to work in the mills?

Mrs. PENTEK. What is?

The CHAIRMAN. What is your experience, if anything? Did anybody come to you and tell you not to allow him to work in the mills?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes; they just come to scare us, tried to scare us, told me not to let him go to work because if he go they will kill him.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know who they were?

Mrs. PENTEK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And did he stop work for a while?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes; I did have him stop; I stopped him because I was sick and I was scared.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know who they were that talked that way to you?

Mrs. PENTEK. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you know of others who have been scared, any of your neighbors?

Mrs. PENTEK. They are afraid to talk.

The CHAIRMAN. What is this baby you have in your arms, Hungarian?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you read the Hungarian paper to your children?

Mrs. PENTEK. My children read the English.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they speak Hungarian?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you use the Hungarian language in your home?

Mrs. PENTEK. Sure. The children talk English.

The CHAIRMAN. And you and your husband talk Hungarian?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't you talk English?

Mrs. PENTEK. Some I talk English. If I talk English I can speak to you.

The CHAIRMAN. You talk English in your home some, then, do you?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do your children go to school?

Mrs. PENTEK. My children were——

The CHAIRMAN. Do your children go to school?

Mrs. PENTEK. Yes, sir.

(The committee then went to Second Avenue and Dixon Street, Homestead, Pa., where another crowd of strikers had congregated, and questioned the strikers as follows:)

## STATEMENT OF MR. SVER KABONSKI.

Senator McKellar. What is your name?

Mr. KABONSKI. Sver Kabonski.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a striker?

Mr. KABONSKI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What made you strike?

Mr. KABONSKI. I can't talk. [A bystander was then utilized as an interpreter.]

The INTERPRETER. He says he wants to work eight hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you satisfied with your pay?

Mr. KABONSKI (through interpreter). No, sir; he is not at all satisfied with it.

(The balance of the statement was taken through an interpreter.)

The CHAIRMAN. What do you think you ought to receive? How much did you receive?

Mr. KABONSKI. Forty cents an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many hours did you work?

Mr. KABONSKI. Twelve.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you get pay and a half for overtime?

Mr. KABONSKI. No, sir; not anything.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you get?

Mr. KABONSKI. Forty-two cents.

The CHAIRMAN. You just got 42 cents an hour?

Mr. KABONSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what was your occupation in the mill?

Mr. KABONSKI. Laborer.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there out on strike?

Mr. KABONSKI. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him if he belongs to the union.

Mr. KABONSKI. Yes; I belong to the union; I am a union man.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there out on strike?

Mr. KABONSKI. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any other reasons?

Mr. KABONSKI. Here is a paper that will show how many were out on strike.

The CHAIRMAN. That paper may go into the record.

(The paper referred to is here printed in the record in full as follows:)

## IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

On September 22 the steel workers struck all over the country, in practically every steel plant.

The following is the number of men on strike at the various places:

Pittsburgh .....	15,000
Homestead .....	9,000
Braddock .....	5,000
Rankin .....	3,000
Clairton .....	4,000
Duquesne-McKeesport .....	12,000
Vandergrift .....	4,000
Brackenridge .....	5,000
New Kensington .....	1,100
Apollo .....	1,500
Leechburg .....	3,000
Donora-Monessen .....	12,000
Johnstown .....	15,000

Coatesville .....	4,000
Youngstown district (Hubbard, Lorain, Struthers, Canton, Alliance, Massillon, New Philadelphia, Sharon, Farrell, Butler, New Castle) ..	60,000
Wheeling district .....	60,000
Cleveland district .....	15,000
Steubenville .....	7,500
Chicago district (Gary, South Chicago, Indiana Harbor, East Chicago, Hammond, Evanston, Waukegan, Milwaukee, Sterling, DeKalb, Joliet) .....	80,000
Buffalo .....	12,000
Pueblo .....	6,000
Total .....	304,100

Pay no attention to the lying statement in the press. The steel workers have almost every steel plant in the country shut down. Now is the time to win our great victory. We can not lose if we will but stick together.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ORGANIZING IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

*Pittsburgh, Pa.*

Senator McKELLAR. What country are you from?

Mr. KABONSKI. Russia.

Senator McKELLAR. Ask him who organized the strike here.

The INTERPRETER. He says that the union organized it.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you remember who it was?

The INTERPRETER. He says the union organized it.

### STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN POWELL.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. POWELL. John Powell.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you from? Were you born in this country?

Mr. POWELL. I came to this country. I was born in the old country.

Senator McKELLAR. Whereabouts?

Mr. POWELL. Austria-Hungary.

Senator McKELLAR. And how long have you lived over here?

Mr. POWELL. Nine years.

Senator McKELLAR. And how long did you work for the company?

Mr. POWELL. Nine years at Homestead and 17 years in this country.

Senator McKELLAR. And what did they pay you?

Mr. POWELL. Forty-two cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. And it didn't make any difference how long you worked, you just got the straight 42 cents an hour?

Mr. POWELL. Straight, 13 hours work.

Senator McKELLAR. And have you any other complaint except lack of proper pay?

Mr. POWELL. Nothing at all.

Senator McKELLAR. Nothing at all.

Mr. POWELL. No.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you think would be a reasonable amount of pay for you? How much an hour?

Mr. POWELL. We want 75 cents and 90 cents an hour.

A VOICE. And a union.

Mr. POWELL. We want eight hours and a union. We want eight hours.

**STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN MALCOLM.**

Senator McKELLAR. What is your name?

Mr. MALCOLM. John Malcolm.

Senator McKELLAR. And where are you from?

Mr. MALCOLM. Russia.

Senator McKELLAR. And what proportion of the strikers are from other countries and what proportion from this country; could you tell?

Mr. MALCOLM. I could not tell.

Senator McKELLAR. Are the largest part of them from other countries?

Mr. MALCOLM. Yes; from other countries.

Senator McKELLAR. A large part of them are from the old countries?

Mr. MALCOLM. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. More than from this country?

Mr. MALCOLM. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you say that the reason you struck is because of the eight-hour day, and because your pay is not adequate?

Mr. MALCOLM. We want eight hours and a union. We want a union and eight hours, everywhere.

Senator McKELLAR. And what did the organizers tell you about getting bigger pay?

Mr. MALCOLM. We want the Government to fix the union and eight hours a day and 90 cents an hour. We want the union.

A voice. It costs more to live around here.

Senator McKELLAR. How do your wages over here compare with the wages you received in the old country?

Mr. MALCOLM. Well, in the old country I was making 3 kronens a day in the old country.

Senator McKELLAR. That is in Russia or in Austria?

Mr. MALCOLM. That is in Austria.

Senator McKELLAR. Most of you boys here are Austrians?

Mr. MALCOLM. Austria-Hungarians.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of you people are naturalized? All of you people around here who are naturalized Americans, hold up your hand.

(A number held up their hand.)

The CHAIRMAN. I think about seven held up their hands.

**STATEMENT OF MR. ANDY TOMSK.**

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. TOMSK. Andy Tomsk.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you come from Russia, Mr. Tomsk?

Mr. TOMSK. Austria-Hungary, Slavish.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many do you say are working in the mills?

Mr. TOMSK. There are 12,000 altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many out on strike?

Mr. TOMSK. 9,000 of them are out.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you get those figures; how do you know that?

Mr. TOMSK. I know of that, all of them that is out is union men, belong to the union.

The CHAIRMAN. The union men are out?

Mr. TOMSK. Yes, sir; and many fellows that will not stay in the union.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there 9,000 union men?

Mr. TOMSK. Yes, sir; more than 9,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And 3,000 of them have not struck?

Mr. TOMSK. 3,000 of them are working and 9,000 are out.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you get those figures? Did somebody tell you?

Mr. TOMSK. I know. I worked at the mill.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any meetings?

Mr. TOMSK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have meetings, and did you talk about these things?

Mr. TOMSK. Yes, sir; we hired a hall, and when we got in the meeting they told me.

The CHAIRMAN. They told you that there were 9,000 men out here, did they?

Mr. TOMSK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you boys speak English?

Mr. TOMSK. Everybody speaks English—not very well, but everybody speak English some.

(The committee then drove to the offices of the Dusquesne Works of the Carnegie Steel Company, and were received in the office of the general superintendent, Mr. A. F. Diehl.)

#### STATEMENT OF MR. A. F. DIEHL, GENERAL MANAGER OF THE DUQUESNE WORKS OF THE CARNEGIE STEEL CO.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men have you out, Mr. Diehl?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, we were short this morning 330 men, which is about our normal shortage.

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred and thirty men?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the total number of employees required to run the plant?

Mr. DIEHL. We consider our average daily force to be 5,700. This statement might be of interest to you, and will show you each day before the strike began.

Senator PHIPPS. May we have that?

Mr. DIEHL. I can get you a copy of it. I can give you this sheet. On the 22d we had 4,285 men working on the day of the strike; on the 23d we had 4,658; on the 24th we had 4,861; on the 25th we had 5,017; on the 26th we had 5,158.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the greatest number of men you have had out at any time?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, that is probably—to-day seems to be the great number, 5,220. We are in what we might consider normal condition, except the shortage of labor in some of the plants; that is, the general shortage of labor.

Senator PHIPPS. That is, common labor?

Mr. DIEHL. Forty-nine men are reported short there this morning. I can give you that sheet if you want it.

Senator PHIPPS. We will get that sheet in the record a little later.

Mr. DIEHL. We had on the 29th 5,069 and then 5,190, 5,199, and 5,220, against a normal amount of 5,700—a normal force. When I say “normal force,” that is the number of men, or around that number, but of that number some are off for one reason or another.

Senator McKELLAR. And you say there are about 300 still out?

Mr. DIEHL. We do not consider that we have any out at the present time.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, you are running about 300 below normal, I mean.

Mr. DIEHL. Well, we could almost say that we are under normal conditions. In other words, all our positions—take for instance our blast furnaces, no men short; our open hearth furnaces, 22 men short. We probably have 40 or 50 extra laborers, but they are 22 men short of what we might consider—in other words, if we had them we would work them.

Senator McKELLAR. What proportion of the men out are foreigners and what proportion of the men out are Americans?

Mr. DIEHL. I have that report. I was trying to get that up.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this: If there were no strike on, would you consider your shop now to be in a normal condition?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, we would probably be in this condition: Those other men who are off have radical tendencies, probably, and we would not care to have them, but we could take care of probably 100 more men; if we had 100 more men, I think we would be in first-class condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any Russians among those who have gone out?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there any Bolshevik doctrines being circulated among them?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, it all depends on what you mean by Bolshevik doctrine. The strike has been a strike of fear. On Monday morning, when this strike started, or, rather, for a week before, any amount of them were discussing the question of coming back to work, and they were saying, “If there is going to be a strike, I am not going to work; I am going to wait until it is all over.” Many of the Americans said that same thing; and the result was that on Monday morning there was an absolute condition of fear—an absolute condition of fear all through. Probably I can explain that for you, and Dr. Bodkin and Mr. Trainer can tell you of some of the experiences we had. We had men rushing up to the gates and expecting aeroplanes blowing up the plants, and we had women that were saying that their men—that they would never see them again. Our visiting nurse told me that she had talked with a woman in an upper ward; and she had four men locked in a room and would not let them get out—a son-in-law, husband, father, and a boarder. It is pretty hard to determine—we have a lot of these fellows that were pretty closely tangled up with the strike, and when they were spoken to and asked if they would go to work, they would say that they were afraid.



So it was pretty hard to say who stayed away because they were afraid and who stayed away who were not afraid. Considering the fact that the heaviest organization is going on in the town, I think that we can say that we do not have any of our own workmen—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Have you had any violence here?

Mr. DIEHL. We have had lots of threatening, but no violence. For instance, we had a case of a man being hit with bricks and things like that in the early morning. We immediately started; when this fear first struck them, we wanted to see if it was true, and we wanted to see if that condition of terror was true, and so we decided that if that is a matter of fear, we will police the town as well as we can. There were probably a hundred citizens besides our police force, a lot of police we had in the mill, that went into the homes, and in some instances brought the men to work. I think that that had as much to do with the men coming back as anything else, and also considering the fact that we did not have the rabid element as they did in some of the other towns.

Senator McKELLAR. Was there any one seriously hurt or killed?

Mr. DIEHL. I do not think so; no, sir; I do not know of any.

Mr. WHARTON. There was not anyone seriously hurt in the town at all.

Senator McKELLAR. The fact that liquor is not being sold, intoxicating liquor, do you think that that is helpful or harmful?

Mr. DIEHL. I do not know. We had an awful time—of course the doors were shut in the morning; but lots was being sold in the back, and we know of lots of cases where that happened.

Senator STERLING. What proportion of your entire force of workmen are foreigners?

Mr. DIEHL. I have that right here.

The CHAIRMAN. And what do you mean by "foreigners"?

Mr. DIEHL. You will only have to glance at this, sir [indicating a report]. It is a more or less involved report. These are the men here [indicating on report]: Americans, 2,097; Americans, colored, 344. It shows a total of 55.2 per cent naturalized; 5.9 per cent first papers, and 38.9 per cent unnaturalized.

Senator McKELLAR. Those are the naturalized and unnaturalized; the native-born American citizens, does it show that?

Mr. BIEHL. No; I do not have that. That list—this is the report of the men, after about a week, the men that we considered, after looking around, had never really quit their jobs; in other words, if they came back, they came back of their own volition.

Senator McKELLAR. That is the actual number out?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir; total, 23.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are all Americans?

Mr. DIEHL. Those are all Americans, 23; and American, colored, 1. There are a number of these men who state that they would be perfectly willing to go without work; and they live in other towns; and then to return and take their chances of getting in on street cars and being beaten up. They said that they wanted to work.

Senator McKELLAR. There is a greater proportion of Slavs than any other?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir; that is true. There is a Catholic priest who has been stirring up an awful lot of trouble, and telling those fel-

lows not to work, and telling them if they were men with red blood in their veins they would stay away. I think he has made the worst trouble.

Senator PHIPPS. Has there been much propaganda of that kind in the way of—in the form of meetings? Have you had many meetings in Duquesne?

Mr. DIEHL. No; we have not had any.

Senator PHIPPS. Have they met in their own halls?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, there has been a big house-to-house canvass. They have gone around—

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). And wanted to organize the laborers?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, it was Foster, and there were fellows by the names of Beghan and Sause.

Senator STERLING. Have you done anything to prevent meetings which were to be held for the purpose of organizing aliens?

Mr. DIEHL. Not necessarily for that purpose. Take, for instance, our railroaders, etc., scattered throughout the plant, we had the same condition of organized men, one place or another, but, as a matter of fact, in some of our plants, while, of course, I do not suppose it is generally admitted, yet a number of the unions feel they are perfectly satisfied to have them go into the plants, because when they are out of work on the outside we became more or less of a harbor for them.

Senator PHIPPS. But before the strike was called you knew that movements were being made to organize the men here, did you not?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And it has been charged that as soon as you found that a man had joined the union that he was promptly discharged?

Mr. DIEHL. There were a lot of them that we knew had joined the union, and when they were sent back to work we went to work—we went to them and tried to explain to them just what it meant, what they were trying to do.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you keep a record—that is, a discharge sheet—showing how many men are discharged day by day?

Mr. DIEHL. I do not know that we have it in that form. Of course, we have our regular discharges.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, as a matter of comparison, do you suppose that you could give this committee the number of men discharged day by day and week by week, beginning September 1, until this strike was called, say, for the three weeks, or going back farther, for that matter?

Mr. DIEHL. I will see if I can get that from our employment agent.

Senator PHIPPS. I think that it would be the very best evidence on that statement of the practice of discharging men; I think it would be disclosed by your record of the number of men who were discharged.

Mr. DIEHL. I do not think it could show you anything at all, because—well, there has never been such a thing as wholesale discharge of men of that kind.

Senator PHIPPS. It has been strongly alleged.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it has been alleged that when the men came to work that you gave them some kind of cards on which they had to state whether they belonged to a union or not; did you do that?

Mr. DIEHL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been charged.

Mr. DIEHL. That is not so. There has never been such a thing. As a matter of fact, many—when—at no time would any man be affected if he did not quit his work or just come with the idea of disturbing the general force.

I do not know of a man up until this time, when we knew just what this agitation was, that these men were coming in and stirring up trouble—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Have you any idea of how many of the men are union men?

Mr. DIEHL. Now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DIEHL. I could not say.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not pay any attention to that?

Mr. DIEHL. I hear from time to time that some of the boiler makers and the machinists are union men, and most of them when they come in here say, "We have got to belong to a union when we work outside."

The CHAIRMAN. You do not make it a rule not to employ union men?

Mr. DIEHL. That has not been our rule, Senator; no. But at the same time, if union men come in here and create a disturbance in the plant, why, that man would become a disturbing element. I do not know—I have been here as general manager for a year—and with the exception of a few of these agitators—the men who have been agitating throughout the works, I do not know of a union man that has been discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. You claim the intention of employing men to look into their past to find out whether or not they are Bolsheviks?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, our labor condition has been so short that we took about whom we could get and tried to control them.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any movement throughout the mills to Americanize these men?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir. We have done that. We have our schools, and we are having our apprentice schools, and we had teachers for three or four years during the war, and a number of these activities were discontinued; that is, they were discontinued in practice. There is another big movement going on for Americanization, which we have always kept—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Do you do any of these things now?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any night schools?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, I can not exactly tell you. Is Cox downstairs? I wish you would speak to him about it, as he has charge of that. Before you go I want to show you some pictures of our welfare work [exhibiting albums containing pictures to the committee]. These are photographs. This has been going on since 1914 [indicating in the album].

Now, we are trying to help these people, to help living conditions, and their working conditions, of all these people, by raising them above themselves. We have organized what we call our nurseries, and we have in the nursery a visiting nurse, two matrons who are looking after the children, and who are looking after the charity in the town, and distributing food and clothing and coal. In the Planters plant itself we have been presenting all the coal to these people [indicating photograph].

Senator STERLING. How about hospital services? Have you hospitals?

Mr. DIEHL. We have built a hospital at a cost of about \$40,000, which is an emergency hospital, and where all of our hospital cases go that are serious.

Senator STERLING. And is that service furnished free to the employees?

Mr. DIEHL. Oh, yes.

Senator STERLING. In addition to that, do you give any medical attention free?

Mr. DIEHL. All the time; that is, for our men who are hurt, and in many cases men who are sick and that sort of thing. For instance, the men who are crippled—I suppose there is hardly a week passes but what men have been hurt for some time, that we have gotten artificial limbs for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there more accidents happening among the men who do not speak the English language than those who do speak the English language?

Mr. DIEHL. I do not think so. I think one of the best conditions on that—we have instructors in our apprentice schools, where there are probably five or six instructors in that branch, or about 10 instructors in that.

Senator STERLING. The apprentices are young boys, are they?

Mr. DIEHL. They are the boys learning their trade.

Senator STERLING. At what age?

Mr. DIEHL. At about 18 they are started in. This is a post-graduate class [exhibiting photograph]. With the boys who are progressive we take them and put them on a two years' course. There are a number of them like this one [indicating] and that one [indicating.] They were boys from the mill, and we have taken them and trained them, given them a two years' training; so that after they have finished that we can put them in one department or another.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that picture [indicating]?

Mr. DIEHL. Most of these children and women, their husbands have left them or have been hurt or have deserted them, and they become the town charities. For instance, here is the teaching [indicating a picture]. This is the school we have for housekeeping [indicating]. These are the houses, or this is the house at that time—it was in 1914, and we kept up that activity until this year.

Senator STERLING. Has the company built many houses for the employees, either for sale or for rent?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, we have built 96 houses, which we are renting. We have got photographs of those houses around here somewhere. They are pretty nearly all completed now.

Senator STERLING. On what terms do you rent them when you rent the houses to the employees?

Mr. DIEHL. We are renting at terms probably a little lower than the renting conditions of the town, but the cost of the building is such that we realize only 2 or 3 per cent.

Senator STERLING. You realize that, 2 or 3 per cent?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes; we have to do that. This town at the present time is congested, and there are probably 15 or 18 per cent of the force living outside of the town.

Senator PHIPPS. Because of the shortage of housing accommodations?

Mr. DIEHL. Shortage of housing conditions, and we have an appropriation in New York asking for \$2,000,000 for more houses. You can see these houses in the pictures; with these gardens [indicating] that we developed. We had—

Senator STERLING (interposing). Has the company made loans to employees for the purpose of building?

Mr. DIEHL. We are doing it. There is another appropriation, which was really originated in this plant, whereby the loans would be made so that in about 12 or 14 years the house would be paid for and the employees would build them under their own plans. It was taken before Judge Gary, and he approved it three or four months ago, and the details are being worked out.

These are some of the same pictures [indicating]. I can show you after luncheon, if you can take about 15 or 20 minutes, I would like to show you the moving pictures of this whole thing, taken four or five years ago, and another one of a picnic that we gave some time ago for the benefit of safety.

Senator PHIPPS. I think that the committee would like to hear from Dr. Bodkin as to his personal experiences in and around the town at the time of the calling of the strike, and since. Dr. Bodkin, you have been in a position where you have mingled with these workmen that have gone out on the strike, and you have observed the conditions, have you not?

Dr. L. H. BODKIN. Yes, sir.

#### STATEMENT OF DR. L. H. BODKIN.

Senator PHIPPS. What do the men say that they strike for?

Dr. BODKIN. Now, Mr. Phipps, if I may answer that, I am in very close touch, as you know, for 30 years past, with the men of this mill. I come in daily contact with perhaps as many men as any other single man in the mill. I also see them in their homes. I do not suppose that there is anyone who has been here six months that does not know me. I am in their homes, and their wives know me.

A very large element that has to do with the strike is fear. I went to some of the citizens on the morning of the 22d—that was on Monday morning—and I went into their homes, and I asked them why they did not go to work. Some of them had not gone to work, and I asked them that, and they said "We are afraid."

I can illustrate that to you by giving you my experience with a boy we had here better than any other way. He was hurt. On Monday night I had a boy hurt; he had his big toe pretty badly hurt. I did not see him that night, but the nurse saw him, and from the report on the case in the morning I saw that his toe was pretty badly injured. I sent for him in the ambulance as soon as I came down.

I went down to the hospital to see the condition of the toe. Well, the mother refused to let the boy go, and she clung around his neck, and the ambulance came back there, and they told me that it was impossible to bring him. I said, "You go right back and bring that mother and that boy; put them both in the ambulance and have them come." They came. Now, after she saw the conditions there, after she saw how the boy was treated, there was no trouble whatsoever, either in the mill or out of the mill, and she was perfectly satisfied and perfectly contented, and she passed my house in the evening when I was sitting on the porch in the evening and she was all smiles.

Senator STERLING. How old was this boy, Doctor?

Dr. BODKIN. He was 18 years old. He was learning his trade.

Senator STERLING. Do you think that that condition of fear existed elsewhere, was general among the employees who were remaining away from work?

Dr. BODKIN. Oh, yes. They would tell you stories about it. There were stories—and there were stories that they were coming from McKeesport over here and taking the men here at Homestead, and they were coming with aeroplanes, and that they were going to fly over the place and bomb the town. I think that was spread among these men.

Mr. DIEHL. That aeroplane story was really funny. The first time I heard it it was to the effect that there were going to be 5 aeroplanes that were going to bomb the plant, and the next there were 14, and then it got as high as 75. Whatever was the basis of that I do not know, but that story was about.

Senator STERLING. Were you able to find out who was spreading the stories that awakened that sort of fear among the men?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, it seemed to be general. They did not know who started it, except that everybody believed it. There were some cases where there were men who were threatened, and the fellows themselves would come in and say they were threatened, and I would say to them, "Would you appear against them? Will you testify against them?" No; they would not do it. It was very hard to get these men to do that, because they were afraid of the future.

Senator STERLING. Was Mr. Foster here prior to the strike?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes; he was here trying to hold a meeting, but the meeting was not held.

The CHAIRMAN. What happened to the meeting?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, we simply prohibited it.

The CHAIRMAN. The authorities prohibited it?

Mr. DIEHL. On the ground that they said they were going to hold the meeting without having a permit.

Senator STERLING. What day was it that they were trying to hold that meeting, prior to the 22d?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, it was about two weeks. It was September 12.

Senator STERLING. Who do you regard as the head of the strike?

Mr. DIEHL. Why, Foster.

Senator MCKELLAR. It is claimed that it is in the hands of 24 organizations?

Mr. DIEHL. Well, of course, I do not know that of my own information, but that is—my information on that is that when they were

first—when the American Federation of Labor first authorized this strike it was authorized first at the instigation of Foster and Fitzpatrick and a few more. Then after they had done that, why, it was up to the American Federation of Labor to back up their action, and in a number of meetings they have had not more than—well, I think in one meeting, from what I understand, there were only four of the international presidents that were present.

Senator PHIPPS. Did they ever take any vote—a strike or not-to-strike vote, in the mills prior to September 22?

Mr. DIEHL. Not that I know of.

Senator PHIPPS. And did they take any such strike vote in their lodges so far as you know?

Mr. DIEHL. Not that I know of. I think that vote was taken in Youngstown. I do not think the question was ever broached here.

Senator STERLING. What were Foster's methods otherwise? Do you remember of him having circulated his book called Syndicalism or did you ever see copies of it?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes; I have seen copies of that.

Senator MCKELLAR. You have?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir. I do not know that they sent it here, Senator.

Senator MCKELLAR. Do you know Mr. Foster personally?

Mr. DIEHL. No, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. Do you know whether he is a worker or what his trade is?

Mr. DIEHL. I do not know that. I imagine he was formerly an editor or something like that.

Senator STERLING. He was a car inspector, belonging to the railway union.

Mr. DIEHL. He was the editor of an I. W. W. paper down in Newcastles.

The CHAIRMAN. New Castle, Pa.?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes, sir. It was a paper called the—I have forgotten.

Senator STERLING. As I understand you you have practically no trouble in your mills at the present time?

Mr. DIEHL. We have practically finished if we are let alone. For instance, we are continuously—we have to be on our guard, because men are coming in here from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. You refer to the agitators?

Mr. DIEHL. The trouble is people who are getting at our men indirectly—the trouble is with the people who are threatening our men indirectly, and we get them, but at the same time they will not appear against them. We had a case night before last where we asked a man to appear against some other fellow who had thrown him out of a house because he worked, and they came up to him and hit him over the head with a stick. We asked him to appear against them, and he said no. He said that the man would be fined, but that after he was fined he would get him again.

Dr. BODKIN. I was going to say, in reference to the injury business, that to the best of my knowledge, and I am in pretty close touch with the situation, that there was only one man injured; and he was hit with a brick. I went into the house of a man who had worked in the mill for 26 years, and I knew the man very well. He had not come to work and I saw him and I asked him why he had not

come to work. He said that he was afraid. I said to him, "Is it possible that after working 26 years here you are going to throw away your pension which you can get in a few years? If you are sick and not able to work, very well, but there is a good pension coming to you, if you get hurt here, outside or inside the mill, there is a pension coming to you. Is it possible that you are going to throw that away after 26 years' service?" He says, "I go to work tomorrow."

Senator PHIPPS. Now, how about the intimidating of the wives of these workers? Do you know anything about that?

Dr. BODKIN. Well, that was simply gossip, so far as I know, and talk. The women were simply very much afraid. They were very much afraid. There was one instance where a man did not come; that evening his son-in-law was hit with a brick in going to the closet in the back of the yard; after coming back he was hit with a brick. He was not badly injured, of course, but he was hit by some one. This man's son-in-law—he went to work one Sunday night or Monday morning, and on Monday evening, Monday night, he was hit with a brick; and that scared the old man away.

Senator MCKELLAR. Have you a State constabulary here?

Dr. BODKIN. No, sir. There were two that rode through here.

Mr. DIEHL. Another instance, a man was helping on my car. He slept in my greenhouse, at my home, all night, and two nights after that he slept in the garage, because he would not go home at all because he was threatened.

There are hundreds of amusing incidents that our Americans are laughing at, but I really felt awfully sorry for a lot of these foreigners. One of the plans of these strikers—they have done it on two or three different occasions—is to start marching by the plant. That is, for instance, they would gather in Homestead and Rankin and McKeesport, and there would be a whole crowd of them, and they would start a big parade, and anybody who was not with them and was on the sidewalk, they would push them off the walk and get them with them. That was what created the fear in the plant. They were telling them for two or three weeks beforehand, "It does not make any difference whether you work or not, we will take you."

Senator STERLING. This statement about the different nationalities, can we have a copy of that for the record?

Mr. DIEHL. You may have that one if you wish it.

Senator STERLING. How about this one?

Mr. DIEHL. All right. By the way, here is another thing. In May 94.1 per cent of the men had 24 hours off after working six-day turns or seven-night turns or vice versa. In the month of June there were 95.9 per cent. In July there were 92.3 per cent. In August there were 92.7 per cent, and September, 92.4 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the 12 hours' work? Do they work 12 hours a day?

Mr. DIEHL. Yes; they work 12 hours a day, and they are paid time and a half overtime after the 8 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they want? Do they want an eight-hour day?

Mr. DIEHL. No; they have been having it that way—

Senator STERLING. Up at Homestead a number of the strikers testified that they did not get time and a half, but they were paid



42 cents an hour for 12 hours or 10 hours or 11 hours, as the case might be, straight 43 cents an hour.

Mr. DIEHL. That is absolutely against the rules of the company. I do not know of anything like that, because we will not have that.

Senator PHIPPS. I think I have got an explanation of that. The time and a half time was in force everywhere, and the men had been working in the armor-plate department, and after the war was over they were put back on the eight-hour shift, and they declined to consider the eight-hour proposition, as everybody was supposed to work eight hours a day, and where they did work more than eight hours they were not paid the time and a half time.

Mr. DIEHL. We had some cases in our railroad where the men were paid straight railroad rates. Those men have been transferred to our own plant in most of the cases.

Our railroaders are working eight hours, and our greatest trouble with the foreigner is to hold our 10-hour men. All those men are hard workers. These men are working 10 hours. I venture to say that 95 per cent of those men will take a 12-hour job, if they can get it, in preference to 10 hours. They want the money.

The CHAIRMAN. What do the foreigners do with the money?

Mr. DIEHL. Most of them have it down in their socks. Pretty nearly all the foreigners are buying in this town.

The CHAIRMAN. Buying homes?

Mr. DIEHL. Any amount of them; yes, sir. I have a list over there, I suppose, of maybe 200 foreigners who want to get into these houses. We have only built 96 of them, and we are away overordered.

(The committee thereupon had lunch, and it was then shown a moving picture at the Duquesne works of an outing given the employees by the company, the object of which was to inculcate in them the idea of carefulness or "safety first.")

(The statements referred to in Mr. Diehl's testimony will be found at the conclusion of the testimony given at Pittsburgh.)

(After lunch the committee went to the billet department, then to the machine shop, and then to the hospital. At various places in the different departments there were signs up "Danger," printed in six languages. At the hospital the following took place:)

Mr. DIEHL. This is our hospital; and this whole hospital is for emergency work.

Dr. BODKIN. This is the waiting room, where the men sit down when they are brought in. They may have injuries to the fingers or toes, or different things; and they go in and come into this waiting room here. This is where most of our work is done [going into another room]. This is our operating room, where we perform all of the operations. This is our sterilizing plant [referring to a portion of the operating room].

Senator STERLING. How many, on an average, do you think that you have in here a day?

Dr. BODKIN. Well, we make about 60 or 70 dresses a day of fingers and toes and everything.

Mr. DIEHL. We do not have that many accidents every day, though.

Dr. BODKIN. No; they are coming here to be dressed, from time to time. A majority of the men who come here are working.

This is what we call an ambrine. It is used with burns.

Senator McKELLAR. It is an antiseptic?

Dr. BODKIN. No; it is not an antiseptic, but it is a kind of wax which is spread over the burns. After they get that on, we keep it entirely away from the air, and put another layer on it, and cover it with cotton. When that comes off, it comes off easily, without hurting any. That slips right off [indicating].

This [referring to another room] is a little wardroom that I have to make the men comfortable, you know, in case they are waiting to be sent to the hospital.

Senator McKELLAR. It has eight places for them?

Dr. BODKIN. Yes, altogether. In the extreme hot weather we have some hot applications here. We have a very nice bed in the room, and they lie on that, and it is surrounded by cold water. This bed goes in this bathtub, and it is surrounded by cold water, and it is of wonderful benefit.

This is where we keep our linens and so on, and this is where we keep our reports [indicating].

In this room [entering another room] we have a room for the nurses, and we have a toilet for them for their own convenience.

Senator McKELLAR. It is very nice.

Dr. BODKIN. The Carnegie Steel Co. put up this hospital here and has paid all of the expenses, and will put up a large one, where we will pay all the expenses, with a cook and with great big sanitary kitchens, with 12 ventilators, and we took care of the men, women, and children during the "flu" epidemic. We inoculated every person in the steel works, every person in the town, and at a very great expense.

This [showing a room in the basement] is where we examine the eyes.

During the flu epidemic we took care of whole families. We had as many as 75 at one time. I suppose that we took care of six or eight hundred during the flu epidemic. We took them from the river, off the boats, the cooks, and so on. They came to us from great distances.

(The committee then went to Clairton, Pa., by automobile, and arrived at the general offices of the Clairton Steel Works of the Carnegie Steel Co. at 3.30 o'clock p. m.)

#### STATEMENT OF MR. H. J. DAVIS, SUPERINTENDENT OF CLAIRTON STEEL WORKS.

Senator PHIPPS. How many employees have you here, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. About 4,000.

Senator PHIPPS. And are you running at full capacity?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How many are out on the strike?

Mr. DAVIS. We have got about 2,600 working, and there are about 1,400 still out.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of those 1,300 are foreigners?

Mr. DAVIS. Most of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the most you have had out, or are they coming back?

Mr. DAVIS. Ninety per cent of them—we have got a few of the foreigners back.

The CHAIRMAN. There were some statements made to us on our way up that there was some rioting here last night. What about that?

Mr. DAVIS. No; they had a drunken brawl last evening. I understand they had some wine—you know these foreigners make a great deal of wine about this time, and they were having some little celebration last evening, and I guess one or two of the men said they wanted to go to work and the others said no, and it went from bad to worse.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the first day, with the 70 per cent of the men that went out, could you tell us what percentage of those were foreigners?

Mr. DAVIS. They were all foreigners. All of our foreigners, which was about 65 per cent of the total employees, were all out.

The CHAIRMAN. And about 15 per cent of Americans?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And are the Americans out now, or are they back, as a rule?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; they are back, as a rule.

Senator PHIPPS. Did they take a strike vote before they went out?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; it was a great, big surprise to us.

Senator PHIPPS. Did not you know they were organizing?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; we knew that they were organizing. At least, we were told that they were; but we had no way of finding it out.

Senator PHIPPS. How many did you discharge on account of having joined the union?

Mr. DAVIS. None.

Senator PHIPPS. But you knew that they were joining?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you discharge any for joining the union?

Mr. DAVIS. No; it makes no difference to us whether they are in the union or not.

The CHAIRMAN. It makes no difference; and you make no difference yourself between the fellow who does not belong to the union and the one that does belong to the union?

Mr. DAVIS. No; we never say aye, yes, or no. If he is a good man, that is all that we want.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you found any Bolshevik spirit among any of the men?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, we think so. We have got, I presume, in this neighborhood about 450 that we feel perfectly sure are Reds or Bolsheviks or whatever you want to call them.

Senator STERLING. And how many of those are Americans?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, they are mostly Dalmatians or Croats or Russians and Horwats.

Senator McKELLAR. "Horwats," how do you spell that?

Mr. DAVIS. H-o-r-w-a-t-s. I think it is something of a Dalmatian. A man told us that he is a Horwats, and we can not find out from him just what he is. It is a sort of a division that they have among each other in their own country.

Senator STERLING. And do you also include the Slovaks?

Mr. DAVIS. No; there are some Slovaks here. We find them who are leaning that way, but not as a general rule.

Senator STERLING. Do you know what proportion of the men are Slovaks?

Mr. DAVIS. No; I can not tell you. We have 39 different nationalities here.

Senator STERLING. At Homestead and at Duquesne the managers gave us a list showing the different classifications of foreigners in the plants.

Mr. DAVIS. I have that, but not since February 21. At that time we had 4,600 employees. Then we have Americans, Slavish, Horwats, Italians, Greeks, Hungarians, Croatians, Swedes, Russians, Scotch, Lithuanians, Austrians, Servians, Dalmatians, Polish, German, Welsh, English, Norwegian, Bohemian, French, Finnish, Negro, Hebrew—

Senator McKELLAR. How many negroes have you?

Mr. DAVIS. Just now we have got about 300 of them.

Senator McKELLAR. What sort of workmen do they make?

Mr. DAVIS. Why, some of them are very good. We find the negro that has a family and a place to live, he makes the best man; and we have got the others that come and do not make any good at all.

Senator PHIPPS. Do the white men object to working with them? Do you have any difficulty in that way?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Since the war has been on have you been hampered in getting a full complement of employees?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You have been short of labor?

Mr. DAVIS. We have been short of labor, and we have been seriously hampered—most seriously handicapped. I think that 361 of our men enlisted or went into the draft, and we have had this big construction job going on during the war building the by-product coke-oven plant. We have a plant of 768 ovens.

Senator PHIPPS. That coke oven is on the other side—

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; it is right down here. There is the beginning of it [indicating], and it extends from there about three-quarters of a mile down.

Senator McKELLAR. And you are short about 1,400 men now, are you? Has that stopped the plant?

Mr. DAVIS. No; we have one blast furnace in operation. I may say that nearly all of our men, with the exception of some at the blast furnaces, that some of them have been with us for 18 years; and the best that we can get from them is to the effect that they were scared out. They did not want to strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Who scared them?

Mr. DAVIS. I can not tell you that, Senator. This man tells us that he is afraid. I ask him, "What are you afraid of?"

"Oh, he will shoot me."

"Who shoot you?"

And they won't tell. I have had several instances of that kind happen.

The CHAIRMAN. Could we get hold of any of those men anywhere in town?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know whether we could or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Would we have an opportunity to talk with them upon the street?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; but that is about the way our boys talk. I have talked to several of them. One said to me, "I am afraid."

I said, "What are you afraid of?"

"Oh, he will shoot me and kill my family."

I said, "No; you are in the United States of America now. The men don't do that here."

"Oh, I don't know; maybe not next week, but maybe next year, and maybe they come in from outside."

Senator STERLING. Have any of them been threatened?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. We have only got two cases where we got the men that were doing the threatening, and I may say that one of them was a young fellow of about 20 years of age. I have his American Federation of Labor card in my pocket. He threatened this man, and we took him before the 'squire, and he was fined. That is all there was to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he pay his fine?

Mr. DAVIS. His father paid his fine. There are only two men that we have been able to locate.

The CHAIRMAN. And of these men who are out, what percentage would you say are foreigners?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I would say 99 per cent were foreigners.

Senator STERLING. What would you say as to their being naturalized? Are any of these foreigners out now naturalized?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; they are.

The CHAIRMAN. When you speak of foreigners, you include the naturalized citizen?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Those who are foreign born?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; what we call these are the foreign——

The CHAIRMAN. Those that speak the foreign languages mostly?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And are foreign born?

Mr. DAVIS. A man that came here and could not speak anything but a foreign language.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these men that we saw up on the street as we came down, are those the strikers?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. That North Clairton is a bad place. That is in another borough.

Senator McKELLAR. Do we go back through that way?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Would it not be better for us to take the Elizabeth bridge and go down the other side through Glassport?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; but it is a good ride to McKeesport. You pass through Glassport, I think.

We have had a gradual increase of them returning every day since the 2d of September. I may say that up to last Friday we had paid off but 200 men.

Senator PHIPPS. They are allowing their money to stay, are they?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; to-day is our last pay day, up to the end of the month, and we took in about 700 checks. Now, those men hold their checks; they held them, did not come after the money at all, and to-day, of course, when we pay the men off, when he has no money he will come and get the check.

The CHAIRMAN. How are these strikers living?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, they have got money. I have no hesitancy in saying that nearly all of them have all the way from \$200 to \$3,000,

and several of those tell us they are not going to work until the thing is settled. They say, "I can stand it as long as the company can." They can stand it for three years.

Senator MCKELLAR. Where do they keep their money? In their clothes?

Mr. DAVIS. That class do; the Bolshevist class do, but the real good American, and we have many of them, own their homes and have nice families.

The CHAIRMAN. Do these foreigners own their own homes?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; these foreigners own their own homes and stock in the company, and have purchased bonds and are good citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. And some of these men who are on strike purchased Liberty bonds, did they not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have a physical examination of these men that you take in, do you not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think with this Bolshevist movement and these men that are so full of this Bolshevism, that in your physical examination, that you ought to examine them further and see what their ideas are about government and everything here?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; I should think that we should.

The CHAIRMAN. Haven't you got to come to that?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Quite a lot of fellows are in here and are against the institutions of the country, and they hardly get over here before they begin to holler against the institutions of this country.

Mr. DAVIS. It is very strange. I never called this a strike. It was just a walkout.

Senator PHIPPS. Did they take any strike vote in the mill at all?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon what orders did they go out?

Mr. DAVIS. I don't know. Down here at headquarters I believe that Mr. Brogan, it was passed around—

The CHAIRMAN. Was there a printed order to them?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, it appeared first, I guess, in the newspapers, and then that was talked in conversations, and on Sunday morning at our blast furnaces the men that left to go home for the night turned around and notified the superintendent that they would not be out to-night, although we understand that the strike was not to take effect until 12 o'clock Sunday night, and the night men did not come out, and our boys plead with them to build those furnaces out on Sunday, and they were told "No." I told them no, we had until Sunday, and it takes them until Tuesday to get them out. Every man left except the foreman. Since then we have cleaned one out, and we are operating one now. We lit that last Saturday.

Senator PHIPPS. You have four, have you?

Mr. DAVIS. We have three blast furnaces.

Senator STERLING. Do you know anything about the activities of Mr. Foster?

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, nothing than when he came up here, I heard what he told the boys.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he have a meeting?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He addressed the meeting?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. They held meetings every Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they hold them right along?

Mr. DAVIS. They have not held a meeting since the Sunday before the strike. They held one at large two weeks ago, I think. That is No. 7 mine, back here a mile and a half.

Senator STERLING. Was that literature of his, his little book, around the plant here?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; we had that little book here. Then there was a little bulletin, I have got some of them here.

Senator STERLING. How many have you got, if you can show us.

Mr. DAVIS. I have got something here, I do not know whether you want anything like that or not. Mike Mescrovitch is a man who has been giving us trouble around here ever since before the war. He is a man, as near as I can find out, that has taken out his first naturalization papers, and he is a man who was under the surveillance of the Government authorities; on account of his having these naturalization papers they could not do anything with him, so they said, and one of the Government authorities requested me to keep my eye on him. Here is what Mike told them down there. He was a speaker at one of the meetings. He said that the men were being influenced by the Roman Catholic Church not to join the strike, and he said "I will give you my advice against that of all of the priests. We will buy some good socialistic books and newspapers and we will read them instead of going to the church."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there many Slavic churches here?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; there are two of them.

The CHAIRMAN. More of the Slavs are going out on strike than any of the others?

Mr. DAVIS. I presume that you would call them Slavs. They just come from that little strip of country down there. Here is some of their literature. I just got some of this stuff a few days ago.

Senator STERLING. Have you got either of Foster's books?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not have any now. I did have them here. Would you like to have one?

Senator STERLING. No, no; I am a little familiar with those.

Senator PHIPPS. Were they generally distributed, do you know?

Mr. DAVIS. Those books?

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. No; not with us. We did not allow them to get into the hands of the men promiscuously.

The CHAIRMAN. What were the hours that these men worked?

Mr. DAVIS. We had 12-hour shifts.

The CHAIRMAN. Twelve-hour shifts?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. The night men on the night worked 12 or 13 hours; that is, depending on his partner or his buddy. We are sort of isolated here. In the first place, we do not have houses for all of the men. In the second place, we are dependent upon the trains for the men coming in and going out, and are dependent upon the schedules of the trains. They park the trains about half an hour apart and keep it up—

The CHAIRMAN. Where do the men live? Do they all go home on the trains?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, about 30 per cent of the employees do not live here.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do they live?

Mr. DAVIS. They come from Pittsburgh and Charleroi.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of these papers in foreign languages published in Pittsburgh?

Mr. DAVIS. I could not say, I am sure, whether they are or not.

Senator PHIPPS. I think there are. They used to be.

Mr. DAVIS. I see them reading the foreign papers.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they permit speakers at these meetings in anything but the English language?

Mr. DAVIS. All of the meetings were in the foreign language.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any suppression of the meetings?

Mr. DAVIS. Not until a week ago last Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the State constabulary act or not?

Mr. DAVIS. No. On Sunday the 21st—that is, the Sunday before the 22d—they were stopped, and that was in accordance with the sheriff's proclamation. Previous to that time, however, they held their meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Was his proclamation to the effect that if the meetings were held they must be in English?

Mr. DAVIS. His proclamation was that there should not be any meetings of any kind anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Why was that?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you think that that was a wise thing for him to do?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I do not know, I am sure. They held those meetings there, and the funny part of it was that very few of our men were there. They came in from distances; for instance, they would come in from the coal-mining districts. They were mostly coal miners.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was that woman killed?

Mr. DAVIS. That was at Allegheny Valley, or in Brackenridge.

Senator STERLING. In preventing the holding of the meetings, was it on the theory that violence might be prevented?

Mr. DAVIS. I presume it was, but I do not know. The proclamation was posted. It was out there on the telephone pole, the only one that I saw, and that was put up about Thursday or Friday before the 22d.

Senator STERLING. You knew that the strike had been called before the 22d, did you not, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; we had that in the newspapers.

Senator STERLING. And did you anticipate that there would be a general strike here among your men?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir. I did not. We were very much surprised and disappointed and very much chagrined. Our men swore up and down—in talking to them, you know, we would say to them, "Do you belong to the union?" They would answer, "No." And we would ask them, "What do you think of the situation?" Well, they were perfectly satisfied; they were getting more money than they ever received before. We would ask them, "Do you like your job?" The answer would be, "Yes; I have a good job. The best job that I ever had."



They were not in sympathy with the strike at all. In fact, we canvassed this plant on the Friday before—about the 18th or 19th—and we only had two men who said they were going to strike; they belonged to the union, and, by God, they were going to strike. Only two men.

Senator McKELLAR. Who organized the strike?

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, I don't know. These men came in from the outside—Foster and a man named Brown—and they had Mother Jones here. They were all strangers to us with the exception of a man named Brogan, and this man Mestrovich, they picked up here. This man Brogan, I do not know whether he ever did a day's work in his life, and he left his family up here, and I don't know whether he ever did a day's work in his life.

The CHAIRMAN. We have heard a good deal about the State constabulary riding into the homes and frightening the people, and making them run in every direction. We have not seen any of the constabulary.

Mr. DAVIS. They have not done anything of that kind. The State constabulary dispersed that meeting on the 21st, and they arrested, I think it was 16 or 18.

The CHAIRMAN. That was an indoor meeting.

Mr. DAVIS. No; that was an outdoor meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they claim that it was riotous and unlawful?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know. I know that they dispersed the crowd after the proclamation of the sheriff, the proclamation of the burgess of the town of North Clairton as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Were those people fined?

Mr. DAVIS. No; I believe they were held over for the court. They were taken to jail, and then they had a hearing, and were held over for the court.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the mayor here?

Mr. DAVIS. Mayor Williams of North Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. And is he a worker in the mills?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; he is on our police force and has been for a couple of years.

Senator McKELLAR. Is he a worker in the mills?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He is on the police force and is mayor, too?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; he is on the work's police force.

The CHAIRMAN. And did he issue any proclamations about the meetings?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That there should not be any meetings? Was that the burden of the proclamation?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is one of the things that they complain of, that the company own the mayor and that he gives—

Mr. DAVIS (interrupting). Well, they can not say that here, because they held their meetings and nobody seemingly—that is, so far as I know—I know that I did not and the rest of my superintendents and others—pay any attention to it. We did not feel that our men were going out. As I told you, it was a great big surprise to us.

Senator McKELLAR. But 68 per cent of your men are out, you say? They went out?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And now about that many has come back?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have that many belonging to the union?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I can not say how many of them did belong to the union. I have not any knowledge. I made a statement to our boys that I would not be surprised if every mother's son of them belonged to the union. We do not know. We do not know anything about it.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever do anything to discourage the formation of unions?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever in any way discriminate against union workmen at all?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir. No, sir. We do not ask a man whether he is a union man or not. I will tell you this, and I do know it to be a fact that there are times when we have a great amount of brickwork to do, and our bricklayers will go down to Pittsburgh and they will pick up a gang of union bricklayers, and they will work at our regular wages and our hours. When they get through with their job they are laid off again. We make no distinction whatever. We do not ask a man if he belongs to a union or not, or whether he has a union card.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not ask him that?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not discharge him just because he belongs to a union?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir. We have got men down there, or did have, who were wearing the union button. It does not make any difference to us, we do not care, it does not make any difference to us whatever so long as he does the work.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they pay to join the union, do you know?

Mr. DAVIS. Three dollars was what was charged here, and that is one of the reasons why a number of these men did join. They were told at this meeting, "Now, this mill is going to be unionized, and if the corporation shuts the mill down, Mr. Wilson is going to run the mill, and then he is going to give us \$40 and \$50 and as high as a hundred dollars, and you must join the union or you can not work unless you belong," and they just scared them into it.

Senator McKELLAR. Did they mean the President when they said "Mr. Wilson" was going to run the mills?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Government ownership?

Mr. DAVIS. I presume; I can not tell you what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they talk about running the mills by themselves?

Mr. DAVIS. No; there is none of that talk. To illustrate, an Italian was on a strike and he was asked—he was not at work—and he was asked if he was on a strike. His answer was "No."

"Do you belong to the union?"

"No."

"Why don't you go to work?"

"Afraid."

"Afraid of what?"

"Each other."

Another one was asked why he was striking, what he was striking for, and he said "For 8 o'clock."

The CHAIRMAN. 8 o'clock?

Mr. DAVIS. 8 o'clock.

Senator McKellar. Most of them seem to want an eight-hour day, the right to belong to the union, more pay and better conditions—most of those I have talked with and asked them what they wanted.

Senator Phipps. Do you have the basic eight-hour day, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Senator Phipps. How long have you had that?

Mr. DAVIS. We have had it since October 1, last year.

Senator Phipps. 1918?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not quite understand this basic eight-hour day. They say that they have an eight-hour day. Do they have to work more than eight hours?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. They have to work more than eight hours, for the reason that we do not have the labor. We can not get the labor.

Senator Phipps. You could not get enough men to work three turn shifts?

Mr. DAVIS. No; we could not. I do not know what the result would be if we were to take a vote on the proposition of an eight-hour day. For example, one of my superintendents said this morning that one of his Turks said to him that he could get more at Turtle Creek on the construction job; that he could get men to go back; that they would be willing to work 18 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, a man that works 12 hours is paid for 14 hours, and the man that works 10 hours is paid for 11 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. They get time and a half for overtime?

Mr. DAVIS. They get time and a half for overtime.

Senator Phipps. And they get that overtime whether they are working on the hourly rate or the tonnage rate?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; and it is continuous after the first eight hours. We assume that as a penalty. We say that we can not get men to work that eight hours, and we must operate the mill at time and a half after the eight hours, and if a man works overtime after the first eight hours, the balance is time and a half.

Senator McKellar. We would like to talk to some of the men out in the shop.

Mr. DAVIS. All right, sir, we will be glad to have you do so. We have a camp here that I will show you. I am also building houses. We have or will have about 350 brand-new houses.

Senator McKellar. Which you rent to the men or sell to the men?

Mr. DAVIS. We rent them. We also make loans to our men in order that they may build houses.

Senator Phipps. We could walk down through the mills to the coke ovens.

Senator Sterling. How do you rent those houses, at what rate?

Mr. DAVIS. They run from \$19 to \$30 per month.

Senator STERLING. And how many rooms are there in those houses?

Mr. DAVIS. Why, from four to eight rooms.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you sell them, what rate of interest do you charge them, when you loan them the money?

Mr. DAVIS. Five per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. They pay a certain amount down?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you loan them the money?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. We have another scheme on foot, not in operation. But I think it will be an awfully good thing. Here is what we will do now. A man wants to put up a house, and he wants to borrow \$5,000. All we ask him is that he has a lot paid for, and then we don't pay any more attention to him. We are going to help that man to build that house, and we will have many designs for him to look over. If he does not know what design he wants, from the blueprints, we can send him to where there is a similar house that is already occupied. We are going to help them to build their houses, in that way.

Frequently we find that a man is very much disappointed who is going to spend \$5,000 in a house and he expects to move in it, and then he finds that he does not find that the light fixtures or the hardware or the heaters and so on, and he is good and mad. He finds that it will cost him from \$800 to \$1,200 more, and he is so mad that the he will never pay his bill.

(The committee then left the office of the superintendent and walked through the mill at North Clairton and interviewed workmen in the mill.)

#### STATEMENT OF I. J. SIMMONS.

Senator STERLING. What is your name?

Mr. SIMMONS. I. J. Simmons.

Senator STERLING. And will you state your position?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am superintendent of the 40 and 28 inch mill.

Senator STERLING. And how many men do you have under you.

Mr. SIMMONS. About 168.

Senator STERLING. And what proportion of the men left during the strike?

Mr. SIMMONS. About 50 per cent.

Senator STERLING. Have any of them returned?

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, yes; I should say that there has been about seven or eight of them returned.

Senator STERLING. What proportion of them do you think struck through intimidation, if any?

Mr. SIMMONS. I believe that better than 85 per cent of them were away from their work on account of being intimidated.

Senator STERLING. Did any of them ever say that to you, or did you learn that in some other way, depending upon others?

Mr. SIMMONS. Why, we have tried to investigate all of these things, and when we saw these men on the street, we would talk to them, and they simply told me "They will fix me." We tried to investigate and find out who did try to intimidate them, but it is very

seldom that you can get any one of them to point out the particular men that did it.

Senator STERLING. What nationality are the men who went out on strike?

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, it is composed of the men who are called Horvats, Croatsians, Italians, Russians, and that Slavish family—the Dalmatians, and the rest of those, you know.

Senator STERLING. What proportion of the men who went on strike do you think are naturalized American citizens?

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, I could not say. There are very few of them that are on strike that are naturalized American citizens. There are very few.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been in the country, Mr. Simmons, about?

Mr. SIMMONS. About 17 years.

Senator STERLING. Have you any other statement to make?

Mr. SIMMONS. The fact is I was with the company for 7 years before I came to this division, and I started in at \$1.82 a day.

Senator STERLING. And in what year was that?

Mr. SIMMONS 1902.

(The committee then left the works at North Clairton and proceeded to the town of Clairton, where a crowd of strikers had assembled. Strikers were then interviewed by the committee, there being about 125 gathered on a corner.)

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE MIKULVICH.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. MIKULVICH. George Mikulvich.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your nationality?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Dalmatian.

The CHAIRMAN. And were you working down on the coke works before the strike?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been out on strike?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Since the first day it started.

The CHAIRMAN. September 22?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Three weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. MIKULVICH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in this country, Mr. Mikulvich?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Seven years.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the strike for? How did you happen to go on strike?

Senator McKELLAR. How much money did you get? How much did you get a day?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Forty-two cents an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours did you work?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Twelve hours and 14 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get time and a half overtime?

Mr. MIKULVICH. No.

Senator McKELLAR. You just get straight 42 cents an hour?

Mr. MIKULVICH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And after you worked 8 hours and worked on 14 hours, did you not get time and a half?

Mr. MIKULVICH. No, sir; none of us got time and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what are the reasons you struck? We want to know just exactly your side of it. We would like to hear from you why it was that you boys struck.

(Mr. Mikulvich did not answer, and the balance of his statement was taken through an interpreter.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you interpret this man? We want an answer from him if he will give it, of the reasons why this strike was called. In other words, we would like to know just exactly their side of it and your side of it, if you are one of them.

The INTERPRETER. He tried to tell me where he was working two years ago. He did not understand you.

Senator McKELLAR. No; what we want to know is now.

The INTERPRETER. He said that he wanted—that the reason why these people went out on strike and he went with them was because they wanted to work shorter hours and get more money and better conditions in the mill; better treatment from the bosses and the foremen.

Senator McKELLAR. What he wants is better treatment?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What does he mean by that

The INTERPRETER. The wrong treatment is given to him.

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE MILLER.

Mr. MILLER. Well, if I got sickness in my home, he want to lay me off, if they can not get a man in my place, to take my place, and I have sickness in my home, then if I go home, he will lay me off. When they get a man in my place, they tell me, "Go ahead and stay home." If my family gets sick and I ask my foreman that I want off that day, because my woman is sick at home, he say "All right," and he will go around and get another man if he can, and if he can not he will let me off. The next day I will come back and there will be a man in my place and I say to him "My woman is better." He will say "You can go home and stay home."

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the way the others are treated?

Mr. MILLER. That is the treatment of every other workman.

The CHAIRMAN. The complaint is that the bosses do not treat you right. Is that what you mean?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you mean that you do not get off when there is sickness in your family and distress in your family? And when you do have a man take your place, they discharge you?

Mr. MILLER. They say, "Go home and stay home if you want to."

The CHAIRMAN. Don't they allow you to come back to work?

Mr. MILLER. Not if they get another man in your place.

Senator McKELLAR. What pay do you think you are entitled to?

Mr. MILLER. Well, there is not enough money for the workmen. We work 13 hours at night and 11 hours at day, and we get 42 cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. And how much is that a day?

Mr. MILLER. For a 12-hour day it makes \$4.20 and for the longer day it makes \$5.04.

Senator McKELLAR. A day?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Why did you strike?

Mr. MILLER. Why did we strike? We did not have enough money so that we could have a standard American living.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you figured out how much an hour you want?

Mr. MILLER. It should be more than that.

Senator McKELLAR. More than 42 cents an hour?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I have a wife and two children——

Senator McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. And take all I make and I can not put one penny aside, and if my family gets sick and I call a doctor, he won't come down for nothing, and I do not make enough money to pay a doctor and he won't come for nothing.

Senator McKELLAR. And your complaint is that the conditions are harsh, in the first place, and the wages are not high enough?

Mr. MILLER. Well, there is another thing. If I get in the mill but three quarters of a minute late in the morning, they take off an hour, off of me. Then if I stay five minutes over the hour I should quit in the mill, they won't give me an hour for the five minutes at all.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they allow you anything for the five minutes?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; they won't allow me anything for the five minutes. They won't allow anything.

They will take it off of me if I am a minute late, but they won't give me anything if I work five minutes overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you worked in the mill?

Mr. MILLER. Thirteen years.

Senator McKELLAR. And what is your nationality?

Mr. MILLER. I am a Serbian.

Senator McKELLAR. And are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. MILLER. I believe I am.

Senator McKELLAR. And you have a right to vote in this country, have you?

Mr. MILLER. Why, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I see that there are quite a number of gentlemen around here, and I am going to ask them how many of them are American citizens, and those that are American citizens I will ask to hold up their hands, so that we can see how many are here. How many have got your full naturalization papers, your American citizenship papers?

(The above was repeated to the crowd through an interpreter, and three of those assembled held up their hands.)

A VOICE. There are plenty of American citizens out on strike at their homes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, gentlemen, we want to treat you all exactly alike. We want to treat the mill owners and the men alike; and we want to find out the exact conditions here. That is the idea of this committee.

## STATEMENT OF FRANK SMITH.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your nationality?

Mr. SMITH. I am a Hungarian.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not naturalized?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. SMITH. Thirteen years. The reason that I am not naturalized is that I have never stayed long enough in one place; stayed long enough to get my papers.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you expect to be naturalized?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I expect to be naturalized, of course, because I have got my family here, my woman, and I have five children; and I have that family, and I would like to know how a man is going to make a living for himself and his wife and five children on \$4.73 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours do you work?

Mr. SMITH. I work 10 hours a day and I get paid for straight 10 hours time.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many days in the week do you work?

Mr. SMITH. Seven days—sometimes six days and sometimes seven days.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you work on Sundays?

Mr. SMITH. Well, not so much.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other causes that led you to strike except the lack of money?

Mr. SMITH. Well, my conditions are all right. I can not say nothing about the conditions. My conditions are all right; and I would gladly do it, and I would gladly keep the work if I could make a living. The conditions I was satisfied with, because I had never been kicked or abused, or anything like that whatever. The only thing that I am complaining against is that we are not getting enough money.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is the only objection that you have got?

Mr. SMITH. That is the only objection that I have got.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there any other gentlemen in the crowd who would like to be heard?

Mr. SMITH. I say that that is not enough for a family of seven.

Senator PHIPPS. You seem to be pretty well dressed?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I am, because I saved it up before I was married, and I have got to spend now what I saved before I was married.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not believe that two people can live cheaper than one, do you?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a union man?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I am a union man.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other complaints? Do you have your own papers here, printed in your own language?

Mr. MILLER. Well, we want eight hours' work and we want more pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they treat you in that way because you belonged to the union?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, they won't allow us in there if they know that we are union men.



The CHAIRMAN. Are you sure about that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I am sure about that.

The CHAIRMAN. And you want the right to belong to the union, too?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; we do. This is the United States and we ought to have the right to belong to the union.

Senator McKellar. Did all of you boys buy Liberty bonds?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; everyone of us.

The CHAIRMAN. All of those present who bought Liberty bonds will raise their hands.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; we all bought them; every one of us.

(In response to the invitation of the chairman to raise their hands to designate that they had bought Liberty bonds, apparently all assembled raised their hands.)

Mr. SMITH. We were all for the United States. We worked day and night for that.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many of you contributed to the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A.?

Mr. SMITH. Every one of us contributed \$3 to them.

Mr. MILLER. We gave three days' work to the Red Cross. We would not go on strike at all if conditions were not so bad that you can not stand it.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the conditions and the plant and the money that you get; you want more money?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

#### STATEMENT OF P. H. GROGAN.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. GROGAN. P. H. Grogan.

The CHAIRMAN. And where do you work?

Mr. GROGAN. I was working in the mill before I got discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you get discharged?

Mr. GROGAN. Because I belonged to the union.

Senator McKellar. When were you discharged?

Mr. GROGAN. On the 30th day of June.

Senator McKellar. I understand that you are going to be in Pittsburgh to-morrow, and we can hear you then.

Mr. GROGAN. I expect to go into the city to-morrow and give a statement then. I will put it off until to-morrow and then I will give the statement.

Mr. MILLER. Did you notice that the policemen did not have any guns on to-day?

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. MILLER. Did you notice that the policemen did not have guns on to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they have guns ordinarily?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; they have great big guns on. They put them away to-day because you were coming here. Other days they have big guns on; and if they see the men on the street they come around with the guns.

The CHAIRMAN. And how about the State Constabulary?

Mr. MILLER. They are not around here to-day, but they were around here yesterday. They knew you were coming. Why, they have 240 volts of electricity on the wire fence around the mill.

(The committee then left by automobile; and at 5:30 visited the plant of the National Tube Co., McKeesport, Pa., and at the entrance stopped and talked with two of the State constabulary, who were fully armed, but because of the great crowd it was thought best not to take the statements.)

(After going through the mill, William A. Cornelius, the manager of the mill, made the following statement:)

#### STATEMENT OF WILLIAM A. CORNELIUS.

The CHAIRMAN. Give your full name.

Mr. CORNELIUS. William A. Cornelius, manager of the National Works of the National Tube Co., McKeesport, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men have you at McKeesport?

Mr. CORNELIUS. Seven thousand altogether is our quota, but we are about 500 shy; but, as I say, we have the mill under normal working conditions now. We are practically back to normal. We never did shut down a department at all, throughout the whole trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. And are most of those who are out on strike foreigners?

Mr. CORNELIUS. We have not any English-speaking men off of the job. They all came in to work, and our better grade of foreigners came in to work also. We have a very small percentage of radicals.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that any of the strikers have been kept out because of threats made against them?

Mr. CORNELIUS. I do not think so at the present time, but I think it is largely due to the fact that we had such good police protection here. The protection consists of the city police and the sheriffs and the State constabulary. If we did not have that, I think that the more radical element would get bad again.

The CHAIRMAN. Had the union held meetings here?

Mr. CORNELIUS. They did up to the time that the feeling got so strong that the mayor of the city was afraid that there would be trouble if they did have meetings, and then he took steps to stop them. You see, we had a riot here on September 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Was anybody killed in that riot?

Mr. CORNELIUS. No; but some of our property was destroyed and one of our superintendents was hit. They entered our plant and tore the clothes off of one of the superintendents. There were about 2,000 or 3,000 in the raid along the plants here, trying to get the men out on September 2. At that time the mayor acknowledged that he could not take care of the situation, and he called on the sheriff, and the sheriff has been in charge here ever since; and we have had good protection, and, as a result, our men have not been afraid to come to work; and those who wanted to work came to work.

(The committee then left McKeesport by automobile at 6:30 o'clock and started for Rankin and Braddock, but the automobile in which the chairman and Senator McKellar was stopped at Duquesne because of motor trouble and delayed for more than an hour in the rain, consequently the meetings at Rankin and Braddock were not held, and the committee returned to Pittsburgh, arriving at the hotel at 8:30 o'clock p. m.)

## CARNEGIE STEEL CO.

Recapitulation of ages of nationalities as of Aug. 1, 1919, for total plant, Duquesne Works.

Race.	16 to 17 years, inclusive.	18 to 20 years, inclusive.	21 to 22 years, inclusive.	23 to 24 years, inclusive.	25 to 26 years, inclusive.	30 to 34 years, inclusive.	35 to 39 years, inclusive.	40 to 44 years, inclusive.	45 to 49 years, inclusive.	50 to 54 years, inclusive.	55 to 59 years, inclusive.	60 to 64 years, inclusive.	65 to 69 years, inclusive.	70 and over.	Total.
American.....	103	225	185	168	451	323	213	168	118	57	47	30	6	3	2,097
American (colored).....	1	14	35	32	68	68	68	36	24	5	2	1	1	.....	344
English.....	1	4	3	5	19	28	18	25	20	9	9	4	2	.....	147
Scotch.....	.....	.....	.....	2	4	4	4	5	6	8	4	2	1	.....	41
Welsh.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	2	4	5	3	7	3	2	1	.....	28
Irish.....	.....	.....	.....	2	4	6	7	10	11	9	7	2	.....	.....	58
Canadian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4
German.....	.....	2	2	.....	5	9	8	14	21	19	10	6	6	.....	104
French.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	2	.....	1	.....	6
Swedish.....	.....	1	4	2	7	6	17	15	11	7	7	.....	2	.....	79
Swedish.....	.....	1	4	2	7	6	17	15	11	7	7	.....	2	.....	79
Italian.....	.....	4	2	7	27	20	27	16	14	6	.....	1	.....	.....	128
Greek.....	.....	.....	.....	2	7	5	6	3	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	23
Swiss.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	2	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	5
Norwegian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	4
Danish.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	1
Hollander.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	185
Russian.....	.....	3	5	7	57	48	40	15	7	2	1	.....	1	.....	201
Lithuanian.....	.....	1	3	7	43	49	46	20	10	19	1	.....	.....	.....	3
Latvian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	185
Bohemian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	201
Croatian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3
Magyar.....	.....	16	15	24	102	146	152	15	15	4	1	.....	.....	.....	223
Slovak.....	.....	5	13	38	192	212	182	157	90	25	10	5	1	.....	743
Rumanian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	980
Ruthenian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7
Bulgarian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	82
Serbian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	25
Polish.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	219
Armenian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	246
Yugoslavian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	34
Albanian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	6
Macedonian.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10
Hebrew.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10
Turkish.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	80
Total.....	117	282	292	366	1,212	1,150	973	747	497	216	182	64	24	3	6,075
Per cent.....	01.0	04.6	04.8	06.2	20.0	18.9	16.0	12.3	08.1	03.5	02.2	01.1	00.4	00.0	100.0

Recapitulation of nationalities as of Aug. 1, 1919. For total plants, Duquesne Works.

Race.	Single.		Married.		Total.	Per cent.	Children and dependents.				Dependents.		Total.	Per cent.
	Duquesne.	Outside.	Duquesne.	Outside.			Under 16.		Over 16.		Duquesne.	Outside.		
							Duquesne.	Outside.	Duquesne.	Outside.				
American .....	774	224	779	320	2,097	34.6	1,214	580	463	148	399	103	2,907	26.9
American (colored).....	124	13	161	86	314	5.7	157	125	23	16	31	9	361	3.4
English .....	22	14	74	17	147	2.4	95	107	89	59	15	11	376	3.4
Scottish .....	3	5	20	14	41	.7	14	32	15	28	7	7	103	.9
Welsh .....	3	..	28	5	28	.5	17	13	32	4	5	..	71	.6
Irish .....	10	..	33	15	58	.9	67	37	74	20	11	3	212	1.9
Canadian .....	1	..	2	..	2	.0	3	5	1	1	..	..	10	.1
German .....	16	2	65	21	104	1.8	162	37	143	30	6	3	383	3.4
French .....	1	..	5	..	6	.1	1	2	6	1	..	..	10	.1
Swedish .....	12	3	44	20	79	1.3	72	41	49	23	13	6	204	1.8
Italian .....	44	9	60	15	128	2.1	131	60	28	8	26	1	264	2.3
Greek .....	5	12	3	3	23	.4	..	8	..	..	..	2	10	.2
Swiss .....	..	..	3	2	5	.1	11	2	4	..	..	..	17	.2
Norwegian .....	1	..	3	..	4	.1	1	..	4	..	..	..	15	.1
Danish .....	..	..	1	..	1	.0	1	..	..	1	..	..	1	.0
Hollander .....	..	..	128	5	133	2.0	114	115	7	8	32	11	287	2.6
Russian .....	51	3	116	10	201	3.3	260	56	23	8	32	2	381	3.4
Lithuanian .....	69	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Latvian .....	1	..	2	..	3	.0	..	4	..	..	..	..	10	.1
Belgian .....	..	..	2	..	2	.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatian .....	85	8	116	13	222	3.7	125	141	18	24	33	18	359	3.2
Slovak .....	102	6	580	57	743	12.2	584	515	120	99	96	49	1,783	15.6
Magyar .....	109	25	739	51	930	15.3	1,491	519	221	73	94	28	2,436	21.6
Ruthenian .....	4	..	7	..	11	.2	2	3	..	..	..	..	5	.0
Ruthenian .....	11	8	49	14	82	1.3	66	82	..	8	5	..	161	1.4
Bulgarian .....	21	3	25	4	46	.8	..	21	..	..	..	..	21	.2
Serbian .....	97	8	113	3	219	3.6	53	144	10	20	23	4	264	2.3
Polish .....	55	7	162	22	246	4.0	218	145	37	26	26	3	465	4.2
Austrian .....	13	4	17	..	34	.5	5	39	..	..	..	..	44	.4
Dalmatian .....	3	2	5	1	6	.1	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	.0
Macedonian .....	5	..	10	..	10	.2	..	2	6	1	..	..	10	.1
Hebrew .....	..	..	7	..	7	.1	17	..	7	..	1	..	25	.2
Turkish .....	37	13	29	..	80	1.3	8	71	..	3	1	..	83	.7
Total .....	1,691	372	3,243	670	6,075	100.0	5,211	2,908	1,374	608	848	290	11,209	100.0
Per cent .....	27.9	6.1	53.0	11.0	6.075	100.0	46.5	25.9	12.3	5.4	7.6	2.3	11,100	100.0

*Recapitulation of time worked, by nationalities, as of Aug. 1, 1919, for total plant, Duquesne Works.*

Race.	1½ years and under.	2 years.	3 years.	4 years.	5 years.	6 to 10 years, inclusive.	11 to 15 years, inclusive.	16 to 20 years, inclusive.	21 to 25 years, inclusive.	26 to 31 years, inclusive.	Total.	Per cent.
American.....	665	230	154	84	69	363	263	168	60	51	2,097	24.6
American (colored).....	290	75	20	6	1	2	3	3	2	8	344	5.7
English.....	16	14	10	7	3	40	30	7	9	11	147	2.4
Scottish.....	11	1	1	1	1	6	6	8	1	5	41	1.1
Welsh.....	4	2	5	2	1	17	10	4	3	7	58	1.5
Irish.....	3	2	5	1	1	17	10	12	2	2	58	1.5
Canadian.....	3	7	4	1	1	26	16	16	15	13	104	1.8
German.....	6	1	4	1	1	26	16	16	15	13	104	1.8
French.....	5	4	4	4	3	10	20	17	7	9	79	1.3
Swedish.....	56	12	9	3	3	17	14	10	3	1	128	2.1
Italian.....	20	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	23	.4
Greek.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	.1
Swiss.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	.1
Norwegian.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	.1
Danish.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	.1
Hollander.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	.1
Russian.....	54	25	26	17	19	37	4	3	4	1	185	3.0
Lithuanian.....	44	12	10	13	11	38	45	20	4	4	201	3.3
Latvian.....	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	8	.1
Bosnian.....	69	20	8	10	13	63	29	7	3	3	222	3.7
Croatian.....	177	72	49	38	49	174	109	69	39	6	742	12.2
Slovak.....	194	83	61	24	41	230	116	114	38	25	990	15.3
Romanian.....	7	6	5	1	1	6	2	2	2	1	32	.5
Ruthenian.....	59	6	5	1	1	6	2	2	2	1	82	1.3
Bulgarian.....	25	8	6	7	7	19	10	18	2	1	25	.4
Servian.....	160	23	15	5	17	48	23	18	2	5	219	3.6
Polish.....	90	23	15	5	17	48	23	18	2	5	246	4.0
Armenian.....	33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	34	.6
Dalmatian.....	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	.1
Macedonian.....	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	.2
Hebrew.....	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	.2
Turkish.....	78	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	80	1.3
Total.....	2,039	600	368	224	238	1,107	704	467	165	143	6,075	100.0
Per cent.....	33.6	9.9	6.4	3.7	3.9	18.2	11.6	7.7	2.7	2.3	100	.....

*Report, by nationality, of employees participating in recent labor troubles.*

Nationality.	Residence.			Naturalization.		
	Duquesne.	Outside Duquesne.	Total.	Naturalized.	First papers.	Unnaturalized.
American.....	14	9	23	23		
American (colored).....		1	1	1		
English.....		2	2	1	1	
Russian.....	45	2	47	2		45
Lithuanian.....	34	1	35	5	5	25
Croatian.....	22	1	23		1	22
Magyar.....	24	16	40	2	7	31
Slovak.....	149	25	174	12	22	140
Ruthenian.....	14	7	21		1	20
Bulgarian.....	5		5			5
Serbian.....	17	1	18	1	2	15
Polish.....	23	13	36		5	31
Armenian.....	4		4			4
Dalmatian.....	3		3			3
Turkish.....	2		2			2
Italian.....	1		1			1
Arabian.....	2		2			2
Scotch.....		1	1	1		
Total.....	359	79	438	48	44	346

*Recapitulation of nationalities, as of Aug. 1, 1919, for total plant, Duquesne works.*

Race.	Residence.				Naturalization.		
	Duquesne.	Outside Duquesne.	Total.	Per cent.	Naturalized.	First papers.	Unnaturalized.
American.....	1,548	549	2,097	34.6	2,097		
American (colored).....	285	49	344	5.7	344		
English.....	101	47	147	2.4	100	27	20
Scotch.....	20	21	41		32	6	3
Welsh.....	23	5	28	.5	23	5	
Irish.....	43	15	58	.9	48	2	8
Canadian.....	2	2	4	.1	3		1
German.....	80	24	104	.8	84	12	8
French.....	6		6	.1	5		1
Swedish.....	55	24	79	1.3	67	9	3
Italian.....	105	23	128	2.1	61	12	55
Greek.....	8	15	23	.4	1	3	19
Swiss.....	3	2	5	.1	4	1	
Norwegian.....	4		4	.1	2	2	
Danish.....	1		1	.0			1
Hollander.....		1	1	.0		1	
Russian.....	177	8	185	3.0	8	2	175
Lithuanian.....	186	15	201	3.3	38	36	127
Lattis.....	3		3	.0	2		1
Bohemian.....	2	1	3	.0	2		1
Croatian.....	208	14	222	3.7	8	23	191
Magyar.....	694	48	742	12.2	97	74	571
Slovak.....	862	68	930	15.3	178	165	587
Roumanian.....	6	1	7	.1			7
Ruthenian.....	60	22	82	1.3	4	8	70
Bulgarian.....	25		25	.4		1	44
Servian.....	212	7	219	3.6	3	15	201
Polish.....	216	30	246	4.0	40	42	614
Armenian.....	34		34	.5	1	4	29
Dalmatian.....	5	1	6	.1		1	5
Macedonian.....	10		10	.2		6	4
Hebrew.....	10		10	.2	2	3	5
Turkish.....	79	1	80	1.3		2	78
Total.....	5,083	992	6,075	100.0	3,354	362	2,359
Per cent.....	83.7	16.3	100		55.2	5.9	38.9

## INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Pittsburgh, Pa.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to the call of the chairman, in the Federal building, Pittsburgh, Pa., Hon. William S. Kenyon, presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Sterling, Phipps, McKellar, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM FEENEY, NATIONAL ORGANIZER, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA.

William Feeney was called as a witness before the committee and was duly sworn and testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rubin, while we have always excluded counsel from the active examination of witnesses, if you desire to do so you may go ahead and question the witnesses in a preliminary way, and then the committee will take the witnesses up and question them. Do you desire to do that?

Mr. RUBIN. I did not intend to ask many questions. I intend to lead the witness up into a situation and let him tell the story, and I will call Mr. Feeney, who will tell the committee of the situation at Monessen and Denora and Rankin.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the witness's name? I did not catch it.

Mr. FEENEY. William Feeney.

Mr. RUBIN. And your business?

Mr. FEENEY. My business is national organizer of the United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you held any office in this State, Mr. Feeney?

Mr. FEENEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. What office?

Mr. FEENEY. Member of the Pennsylvania Legislature 1911 and 1912.

Mr. RUBIN. Now, you go ahead in your own way and tell the Senate committee anything that you can—any information that you have gathered at first hand in the district in which you have worked in Denora.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Witness.

Mr. FEENEY. I may state for the benefit of the committee that I am in charge of what is known as the Charleroi, Monessen, Denora, and that section. My home is in Charleroi, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you prefer to stand up?

Mr. FEENEY. Yes; I prefer to stand up.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there a steel plant in Charleroi?

Mr. FEENEY. Well, there is a small plant in Charleroi.

Senator PHIPPS. Are there any rolling mills in Charleroi?

Mr. FEENEY. No; there are no rolling mills, but what is known as a Hussey Payne Shovel Works, and it is an old plant, and they are starting to make steel.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you a workman in that plant at any time, Mr. Feeney?

Mr. FEENEY. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What experience have you had as a workman in the steel industry?

Mr. FEENEY. I have never worked in a mill in my life.

Senator PHIPPS. You have never worked in a mill in your life?

Mr. FEENEY. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Go ahead.

Mr. FEENEY. I was assigned to a position as local secretary of the Denora, Monessen, and—that section which is better known as the Charleroi section. We had an office in Charleroi, and we have an office in Monessen, and we have an office in Denora, and we have two men looking after the Monessen office and two men looking after the Denora office, and the mills of Denora and Monessen joined the organization, the men in them, and became members of this movement. The strike, of course, took place on the 22d day of last month. About 98 per cent, as near as I can give you the figures, responded to the call of Monessen, Denora, and Allenport. The strike went into effect on Monday, the 22d of September. I proceeded to hold a meeting, a joint meeting, of the men—the workmen from Monessen and Denora—so that I could talk to the men in my humble way and preach peace and harmony, which I had preached to them previous to the strike. Everything in the Monessen and Denora section and Allenport was as peaceable as it was almost possible to be after we held this joint meeting on the 23d day of last month.

The authorities in Monessen seemed to, so far as I could learn, figure that there was too much peace, and wanted to create some trouble, and the burgess of Monessen called a meeting on the 24th and sent out handbills and asked the people to protect their homes, and called a meeting in the high-school auditorium in Monessen, swore in upward of some 500 men, all black and white and colored men, and a lot of them were known as the professional gamblers of Monessen; in other words, the riffraff of the town of Monessen, and it didn't matter what he was as long as he held up his hand. Let me say that everything was peaceable, and we conducted ourselves in accordance with law and order, which I have always tried to maintain wherever I have been. On the 25th, which was on Wednesday, those men were drilled on the ball ground of Monessen, and they received a badge and received a gun, both black and white, and they started a reign of terror in the town of Monessen. Men were jostled along the street at the points of pistols, and men were struck down and shot down, if you please—

The CHAIRMAN. Were any men shot?

Mr. FEENEY. Yes, sir.



The CHAIRMAN. How many?

Mr. FEENEY. There has been in Monessen three or four men shot down.

Senator McKELLAR. Were any killed?

Mr. FEENEY. No; there is not any of them with the undertaker as yet.

The CHAIRMAN. Were these men strikers or otherwise?

Mr. FEENEY. Well, they were—one of them that was shot carried a badge, and he was shot down by one of those colored gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "badge"?

Mr. FEENEY. It is a license to carry a gun, and shows that they were sworn in.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they sworn in as policemen?

Mr. FEENEY. No; they were deputized by the burgess of Monessen.

Senator PHIPPS. That is, for the purpose of special policemen?

Mr. FEENEY. You can call them special policemen if you want to, but they generally call them deputies.

The CHAIRMAN. And who were they that were hurt or shot?

Mr. FEENEY. I can not just recall the names. I came down last night, not knowing that I was to appear here this morning—

Mr. RUBIN. Will you furnish the names later?

Mr. FEENEY. Yes; I can get those.

Senator McKELLAR. Were they the strikers—

Mr. FEENEY. Only the men that had the badges; they were the ones that got the license.

Senator McKELLAR. I mean the other two that were hurt.

Mr. FEENEY. The other two were strikers.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not mean that a man wearing a badge that gave him the license to carry a weapon was shot down by some other special deputy?

Mr. FEENEY. Shot down by the colored fellow. You asked whether the strikers—if they were all strikers or not.

Senator PHIPPS. One of the special deputies was one of the victims?

Mr. FEENEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were any of the strikers shot?

Senator PHIPPS. He said there were two of them shot.

Mr. FEENEY. Won't you let me proceed with the story?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FEENEY. After holding the meeting in Denora—the joint meeting on the 23d—the men at Monessen asked for a return meeting, a joint meeting, as they had to travel a distance of 6 miles. The men of Denora said yes. I secured two lots at the lower end of Monessen. Remember, this was not in the borough, and the authorities knew very well that we had no intention of marching into the borough on the 25th; but they drilled those so-called deputies, with something like 125 colored men—the rest were white—and on the morning of the parade the men were to leave Denora at 9 o'clock and march 6 miles to the other end of Monessen and there hold a joint peaceable meeting.

Mr. RUBIN. Why did they not hold the meeting at Denora?

Mr. FEENEY. We had held a meeting in Denora on the 23d, a joint meeting, so that the speakers would not have to hold so many

meetings. We thought that one meeting would be sufficient for the two places, and the men were willing to march and to hold those joint meetings. I went over in the morning to the men from Denora, and on the way to meet the Monessen boys on these two vacant lots we had secured, the authorities of Monessen started to send those deputies, 500 of them, down the street, armed with rifles, shotguns, and pistols, and every other death-dealing weapon they could secure. They marched to the borough line, and they would not allow the men to come from Monessen to meet with the workmen from Denora. I tried to get through, as I live at Charleroi and had to cross the bridge into Monessen, and I wanted to get through to meet the men marching from Monessen, with 78 uniformed returned soldier boys in the lead, and the American flag in front of 5,000 men or more.

I saw what it meant. I saw the stage set for a long casualty list. They would not let me through, and I went back and got into an automobile, and an old gentleman whose name is—I do not know—allowed me to ride to there on the car. Here was the borough line [indicating], and the 500 fellows armed down here [indicating], and the State constabulary drawn up here in battle formation, about 200 around below, where they were all drawn up there to stop and break up the meeting. I got through the line and went down around there [indicating] and rode about a mile, and I said to the boys, "Boys, go back, go back." A soldier boy said, "Feeney, we do not like to go back. We are not doing any harm. We are peaceable men." I said, "Go back. I see the stage set in Monessen. There are 500 men there, black and white, the riffraff of Monessen, at the borough line. I see the State constabulary there to break up your meeting."

I knew that the men in the rear would want to know what was going on, and the State constabulary, who are ever so anxious to use their clubs on the heads of our people for no reason whatever, will start to club them. Then those fellows back here, who never had a gun in their hands before, will rush down and pour the lead into these men. I knew the papers would be filled with a large casualty list. I said, "I will explain at the other end, boys." We went back to Denora, up on the hill over the Charleroi line, on ground that we had rented. We got the men seated peacefully on the hillside. I stood on the shed on an old man's lot—he gave me permission to speak from it—over to the hillside, which was barren with the exception of the 5,000 or more men that stood there. I pictured them the scene as it was set—as it was set, as I say, to murder them, if you please. We were there conducting that peaceful meeting when the State police, who were waiting in Monessen, and the 500 deputies waiting there, craving for the blood of these people—I am satisfied in my mind they were—left Westmoreland County and came a distance of 6 miles to the peaceful meeting we had, the ground we had secured and paid for, and came around with their horses so far apart [indicating], and our men were sitting on the ground, and they yelled, "Get up or we will drive these horses over you."

I saw what it meant. I knew if our fellows resisted it meant death. I knew there would be many clubbed into insensibility, and

I said "Move." I stood over on the platform, together with the Slavish organizer, who was alongside of me, and he spoke in his language, and he spoke the same as I. He said, "Move, men." They moved. Then they came down to me and says, "You get down out of there." I said, "What is that?" They said, "Get down out of there."

There was two of our boys who had returned from Europe who were holding two flags, and they said, "Furl them flags and get down out of that."

I got down. It was either get down or be clubbed down, and I thought it best to get down.

I went down into Denora, and I went down to the Indiana Hotel and I telephoned to Pittsburgh to let the Pittsburgh office know just what had taken place. An old man, 62 years old, stood there talking to one of those boys, and one of the State troopers came along and said to one of the boys, "Take that uniform off." The old man, 62 years old, said, "He has got as much right to wear that as you have yours."

The trooper drove his horse along the sidewalk and came down on that old man's head until the blood flowed down on his coat, and he came down over his arms and paralyzed his arms with a club.

That man is named Lillyco. He had two sons in the service, one in the army of occupation and the other in the Navy. What will those boys think when they come home and find out what was done to their father when he said that the boy had a right to wear the uniform?

The CHAIRMAN. Won't you please tell us the facts? That is what we want to know. Won't you please just tell us the facts without embellishing them with a speech? I know it is a pretty hard thing to do, but we want to just get at the facts. Won't you do that, please?

Mr. FEENEY. Well, if you came out in that vicinity and if you would see those poor men clubbed into submission, and women included, probably you would like to elaborate on it.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be so.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell the committee about the clubbing.

Mr. FEENEY. So much for that. In Monessen they are clubbing our men every morning, noon, and night. I mean all day long. They do that if they do not move fast enough. They even clubbed a woman the other day because she did not move fast enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Who did that?

Mr. FEENEY. The State trooper, and she was a woman in a delicate condition and is in a serious condition now. They drove her into her home and went in after her and pulled her out, and when she resisted they used the clubs on her back and arms.

Senator McKELLAR. What was her name?

Mr. FEENEY. Her name is Cochiara Concept.

The CHAIRMAN. What was she doing at the time; do you know?

Mr. FEENEY. She had purchased some meat from the butcher's near her sister's home, when she was ordered away and was driven upon by the State trooper's horse. She ran into her sister's home, and she was followed by the police, five of them, and they tried to

pull her from the house and she resisted and was badly beaten over her arms and back. This was a pregnant woman.

Three women were cast into jail in Denora on Thursday.

Mr. RUBIN. Of this week?

Mr. FEENEY. Of this week. This is Saturday. Day before yesterday they were cast into jail, where they languished in jail for about 10 hours, and one with a three months' old child sucking at her breast, in a bastille that is infested with vermin—cooties, as they are generally known, better known over on the other side.

There is another case, of Andy Banks, who was walking down the street in Monessen, near his home, when a city officer grabbed his wife's arm and pulled her away from her husband, who was holding an infant in his arms, and said to her, "Who are you calling a son of a bitch?" Andy, her husband, answered that she had not opened her mouth, whereupon a Cossack began clubbing him over the arms and back, and later took the butt end of his gun and beat him over the body and legs.

Senator PHIPPS. Is this your own statement?

Mr. FEENEY. We have the witnesses—

Senator PHIPPS. But I am asking you about this particular incident.

Mr. FEENEY. After an investigation—and I have written this up in order to keep it in my mind.

Senator PHIPPS. But you were not present when it occurred?

Mr. FEENEY. No; not this case; no, sir. But there are lots of witnesses.

Frank Banks just returned home when he saw his aged mother returning from a grocery store and went to help her. A Cossack was clubbing the old lady and pushing her along when Frank protested, saying that the old lady was suffering with a cancer. The Cossack clubbed him until he was bruised all over his body. While this was going on, a deputy standing near shouted, "Hit him; knock his brains out; kill the dirty son of a bitch." The deputy's name is Hockich.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know all of this. Where did you get it?

Mr. FEENEY. We can get it all sworn to.

The CHAIRMAN. But this particular statement that you read, you gathered that from what others told you?

Mr. FEENEY. We have got it; yes, sir; from investigators in Monessen. I did not see it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you investigate it yourself?

Mr. FEENEY. I went and made a thorough investigation; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And are these reports that were given to you from investigators, or did you write this down from what you yourself found yesterday?

Mr. FEENEY. It is the report given from investigators to me, and wrote up; and I said that I go and visit the people; and those Banks boys, with their aged mother, appeared yesterday before a notary at Charleroi, and I would have had all this had I known that I was going to appear here this morning; I would have had the sworn statement. I can get it by going after it, if you will give me a chance to-morrow.

Mr. RUBIN. I can get all of the witnesses, but I thought that it would be better to bring these statements in a summarized form, because you want to look at the number of witnesses. I thought that I would summarize that in this way and have some one to speak for a number of witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. While we are not governed by the strict rules of evidence, you understand that this would not be competent evidence.

Mr. RUBIN. I understand that.

Tell them about the jails you have seen and the people in them.

Mr. FEENEY. The jails are pretty well filled with our people. The men who refuse to go to work are cast into prison, with trumped-up charges of disorderly conduct, and they are going into their homes—we have evidence that they are going into their homes and holding them up and threatening to kill them if they don't return to their work. We have evidence where men are being corraled by the State troopers and drove to the mill gates and the bosses would congregate them, and those who would sign up to go to work were let go, and the others were cast into jail. We have evidence of some of them taken into a building and lights were flashed down on them, with quite a group of men around there and they were asked to go to work. They were taken down into a cellar and told that they would be hung at 9 o'clock the next morning if they would not go to work.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you got any witnesses of that that will corroborate you?

Mr. FEENEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. We can produce every one of the witnesses.

Mr. FEENEY. I did not know that I was coming in here to-day for this purpose, or I would have had them with me.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you got that man?

Mr. RUBIN. I have such witnesses, from the different parts of the county, but he came in this morning, and I want him to testify and to summarize.

Mr. FEENEY. John Ilyanic was one of the men who was put in a dark room when arrested at the tube mill, among others, and was given the third degree. They were told that they would be hung if they did not go to work. Then they were thrown in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that man here?

Mr. FEENEY. No; he is not a witness here. I did not know that I was going to testify or I would have had some more startling evidence.

Mr. RUBIN. May we have the privilege of producing witnesses to corroborate all the statements made by this witness?

Mr. FEENEY. They were told that they would be hung if they did not go to work.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of the witnesses here?

Mr. RUBIN. No; I listened to his statement yesterday, and I thought it would be of interest to the committee—

Senator McKELLAR. We would like to have the witnesses tell about that; especially where a man was put in a cellar.

Mr. RUBIN. I asked him to get the first-hand information; and I want to give the committee the first-hand information in regard to it. We can produce the evidence on that.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, you can hand to the stenographer these reports of the investigators.

Mr. FEENEY. He requested those, and I have many others, but I just happened to have those in my pocket.

(The reports of the investigations above referred to are here printed in the record as follows:)

#### BRUTALITIES.

October 1: John I. Link was searched while on picket; he had no weapons; he was struck in the face and kicked; he was sick and lay in bed for two days as a result.

October 6: John Breda, a business man, who was opening his place of business when a cossack ordered him to move on. The man did not leave his place, but moved toward the inside. A cossack drove onto the sidewalk and clubbed him severely. He was arrested and fined. Later on, October 10, Breda was rearrested on a charge of having a State police arrested. He is at present on a \$300 bail. He has many witnesses.

John Zayonc was on his way to a bakeshop situated on Schoomaker Avenue near the Monessen Bridge when he was attacked and driven into the tube mill gate and was beaten. He received a bad bruise on his left hand. He was forced to put up \$500 bail.

Witnesses: Martin Plevel, Andy Plevel, George Sutla, Marko Yursick, Stanko Medvet, Gida Klasan, Miko Matko, Frank Smok, Kaza Smok.

Thomas E. Patterson was passing the tube-mill gate when "Bill" Ritchie saw him pass and said to his associates, who were composed of bosses, supers, and Cossacks, "There goes a little son of a bitch you want to get."

Andy Banks was walking down the street near his home when a city officer grabbed his wife's arm and pulled her away from her husband, who was holding an infant in his arms, and said to her, "Who are you calling a son of a bitch?" Andy her husband, answered that she had not opened her mouth, whereupon a Cossack began clubbing him over the arms and back and later took the butt end of his gun and beat him over the body and legs.

Frank Banks had just returned home when he saw his aged mother returning from a grocery store and went to help her out of the crowd. A Cossack was clubbing the old lady and pushing her along when Frank protested, saying that the old lady was suffering with a cancer. The Cossack clubbed him until he was bruised all over his body. While this was going on a deputy standing near shouted, "Hit him; knock his brains out; kill the dirty son of a bitch." The deputy's name is Hotklich.

October 8: Albert Eframson was clubbed on the head while he was passing near a crowd of men. The Cossacks sneaked out of an auto driven by the bosses and stopped dead near the few men, eight of them, and began to club passers-by as well.

October 7: Mrs. Cocchlaro Concett, a pregnant woman who had purchased meat from a butcher's near her sister's home when she was ordered to move faster and driven upon by a Cossack's horse. She ran into her sister's home, followed by the police—five of them. They tried to pull her from the house and she resisted and was badly beaten over her arms and back.

October 8: John Ilyanic put in a dark room when arrested at the tube mill, along with many others, and were given the third degree. They were told that they would be hung if they did not go back to work. Then they were thrown in jail.

October 9: Ella Syrko, of 633 Third Street, at about 7.15 a. m., told trooper to go to bed and not bother around her house. Trooper swung horse against door, breaking it in. This woman in very delicate condition.

Witnesses: Mary Tuplak, 635 Third Street. Elizabeth Sick.

At about 7 p. m. this morning Mrs. Hrapek was standing on her property looking at State troopers, one of troopers followed this woman into house, which terrorized the entire family who had just got out of bed and were not dressed. The trooper caught hold of Mrs. Hrapek and the husband pleaded for him not to take Mrs. Hrapek to jail; then said trooper used club on Mr. Hrapek's chin and injured husband who bled considerable. At hearing, before Squire Ford, the evidence was so scanty that Squire Ford acquitted Mr. and Mrs. Hrapek and children, who were taken along. Troopers No. A 45.

Mikifor Blaschak, 42 Watkins Avenue, sitting in front of home when deputy started after him. Blaschak, in terror, ran into house followed by deputy, who broke in door, causing Mrs. Zomber, who was in a very delicate condition at the time, to receive such a shock that she is in a serious condition through this shock.

Witness: Catherine Knap witness to this. Jacob Zumber was also present.

MONESSEN, PA.

John Ilinik searched for weapon; having no weapon on him he was kicked and struck.

George Wokaly, 1217 Highland Avenue, herded into mill by Cossacks. Asked to sign for work, he refused and then locked up and put under \$500 bond.

John Mondich was terribly beaten over head for no cause; many witnesses present. Joe Fedarko, Mike Beres, Andy Gozuzky, Frank Kancsy, John Mondich, 1456 Schoomaker Avenue.

Thomas Patterson, walking along past tube mill gate, when Bill Ritchie, foreman, called out: "There goes a little s— of a b—; he ought to be got." Bosses, police, and Cossacks present.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you lived in Charleroi?

Mr. FEENEY. I have lived in Charleroi since 1909. I lived up the river in California previous to that, right above that.

Senator PHIPPS. And since 1909 you have been a resident of Charleroi?

Mr. FEENEY. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your occupation?

Mr. FEENEY. I have been raised a coal miner and I have been in the mines. I entered the mines when I was 12 years old.

Senator PHIPPS. Since 1909, have you been working in the coal mines in the Charleroi district?

Mr. FEENEY. I entered the coal mines when I went there, and I left there for the legislature in 1911.

Senator PHIPPS. How long were you engaged in the coal mining after 1911?

Mr. FEENEY. After 1911?

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. FEENEY. Not very long. I was given an assignment as agent of the United Mine Workers' Journal, going around and taking subscriptions.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been an organizer for the United Mine Workers of America?

Mr. FEENEY. I have been an organizer for the United Mine Workers of America—I was sent afterwards—from July, 1911, up to the middle or the latter part of March on the United Mine Workers' Journal; I was given a commission as international organizer.

Senator PHIPPS. To what date?

Mr. FEENEY. I was given a commission in 1912.

Senator PHIPPS. You were given a commission in 1912 as a national organizer?

Mr. FEENEY. As a national organizer.

Senator PHIPPS. But you could not have worked very long after your term in the legislature as a coal miner in one of the mines out there, could you?

Mr. FEENEY. No; but I was willing; that is about the only labor that I know.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there anything else you wish to say, Mr. Feeney?

Mr. FEENEY. No. I would like for you to be able to stop that clubbing of innocent people up there.

Senator McKELLAR. We would like to have the testimony of any clubbing that they have up there.

Mr. RUBIN. We have them here. I thought that we would only be allowed to call 10 or 15 witnesses.

Senator McKELLAR. If you have them here we would like to hear from them.

Mr. RUBIN. I have them here, or will get them. Do you want these witnesses to be produced that he has named?

Senator McKELLAR. That would be the better way, I should think.

Mr. RUBIN. Can you bring them in, those witnesses?

Mr. FEENEY. To-day?

Mr. RUBIN. Yes.

Mr. FEENEY. It is almost a two-hour ride out there.

Mr. RUBIN. Get an automobile and bring them in this afternoon.

### TESTIMONY OF ADELBERT KAZINCY.

Father KAZINCY. May I ask the committee, is Mr. Gary and the rest of the witnesses who have appeared before the committee supposed to take the oath? If so, I am perfectly willing to take the oath.

ADELBERT KAZINCY was called before the committee and having been duly sworn testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. If we recall Mr. Gary he will be put under oath.

Mr. RUBIN. Reverend, you are a Roman Catholic priest, are you?

Father KAZINCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And duly ordained?

Father KAZINCY. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. I beg your pardon, Father. Had I known that you were a priest we certainly would have dispensed with the oath.

Father KAZINCY. That is all right.

Mr. RUBIN. What church and where?

Father KAZINCY. St. Michael's Catholic Church, in Braddock.

Mr. RUBIN. Father, is your parish an English-speaking one?

Father KAZINCY. No; it is partly English and it is partly Slavic; and I am there in February last 24 years.

Mr. RUBIN. It is partly English and partly Slavic?

Father KAZINCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Father, will you, in your own way, describe what you have learned and known and seen and heard since the strike was on, touching the condition of the members of your parish?

Senator PHIPPS. I think that we could take the evidence of what he has heard, but not what he has been told. We want direct testimony of what he knows of his own personal knowledge, and not information that has come to him secondhand; otherwise this hearing would go on interminably.

Senator McKELLAR. I have no doubt but he can tell what he knows himself. Tell what you know of your own knowledge about this strike.

Father KAZINCY. The grievances, you mean, and the transgressions or jurisdiction on the part of certain individuals and the State authorities?



Senator MCKELLAR. What you know about it.

Father KAZINCY. Well, on the 10th of September we had a mission, so called, or, as others understand it, a revival, in our church. On the 14th of September, the following day, which was Monday, the men were leaving church at 10 o'clock in the morning, filing out of the church nicely and peaceably, no doubt with very sanitary thoughts in their minds, and they were suddenly attacked by two of the State constabulary on the steps of the church, all of which I have sent an explanation in the form of a telegram to the governor of the State—

Mr. RUBIN. Don't you mean on the 21st?

Father KAZINCY. On the 21st. I personally walked out in the middle of the street, leaving the church, to stop these men and ask them what did they mean by clubbing peaceful worshippers leaving the church. They said they had orders that these men must move on. I said, "You do not expect them to grow wings in two minutes or in a half an hour. They have been listening to a sermon in the church. They are not a lot of birds, and they can not fly away." They said, "We do not do anything except to keep them on the move."

I said, "They are moving nicely and quietly." They turned around and left.

The following day this occurred at the school, little toddlers, babies, stopped on the steps of the schoolhouse, no doubt attracted by the brilliant uniform of the mounted police, you know, and whilst lingering there and waiting for the school bell to ring, one of those constabularies came around—he had evidently seen some men on the other side of the street—and they jumped their horses into the bunch of children; and it was only God's providence that some were not trampled under foot.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you see that yourself?

Father KAZINCY. I had it from the sisters.

Mr. RUBIN. Do you know the sisters and do you know where they are?

Father KAZINCY. They are all willing to testify to what they have seen.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean to say that they drove their horses in onto those children?

Father KAZINCY. They drove the horses on the sidewalk. Some of the steps are there, and they rode over onto the sidewalk; and they were standing in front of the school, very peaceably, when they jumped the horses into the crowd of children.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe that, Father?

Father KAZINCY. Absolutely, sir.

Senator STERLING. Were there any men among the children?

Father KAZINCY. No; not on the children's side; but there were on the other side.

Senator STERLING. Were there any of the children hurt?

Father KAZINCY. By some miracle—I do not know how—they were not hurt.

The CHAIRMAN. How could they have jumped the horses in among those children and not any of them hurt?

Father KAZINCY. I suppose they acted the same as you and I act. When I see the horses coming I run.

Mr. RUBIN. Will you bring one of the sisters here this afternoon?

Father KAZINCY. They are under the jurisdiction of the authorities, and not allowed to leave their convent without their permission, or I would do it.

Mr. RUBIN. Will you try to have permission for one of the sisters to come here?

Father KAZINCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Just tell us about the instances that you yourself saw and know about.

Father KAZINCY. About two days after this incident had happened I saw a man standing on the other side of the corner from my church waiting for the church bell to ring, and he was taken away by one of the State's constabulary. They drove their horses in among them and they scattered them around. There were men standing over there.

Mr. RUBIN. Did he draw his club, or did he hurt him?

Father KAZINCY. No; nobody offered any resistance. It seemed to hurt the constabulary.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you seen any persons clubbed by the State constabulary?

Father KAZINCY. No; I have not.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you seen them after they have been clubbed?

Father KAZINCY. I have seen one.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell us about him. Who was he?

Father KAZINCY. Michael Hodozich.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you see any wounds? Describe the wounds.

Father KAZINCY. He did not show me any of the wounds, but he told me about the incident. It happened like this—

The CHAIRMAN. This is what he told you?

Father KAZINCY. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Can he be found?

Father KAZINCY. Yes.

Senator STERLING. I suggest that he be found and brought here himself.

Father KAZINCY. If you don't want anything except what I see myself with my own eyes directly, then I am through.

Mr. RUBIN. How about the number of times that the persons have omitted to go to church?

Father KAZINCY. Well, these are from the furnaces in the Brad-dock mills; and in those furnaces they allow the men to go to church every second Sunday. There are nine furnaces there, and furnaces H and A allow the men to go to church every second Sunday. The balance of the nine furnaces do not allow their men at all to go to church. Some get a Sunday off, perhaps, once in six months; but it is not taking care of their souls.

The CHAIRMAN. Do many members of your church congregation work on Sunday?

Father KAZINCY. Most of them work on Sunday; and they do not see the inside of a church more than once in six months, because they are forced to work on Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the membership of the church?

Father KAZINCY. I have 450 families and about 1,890 members belonging to my church.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you tell us whether most of these are American citizens?

Father KAZINCY. I say I should judge about 25 to 50 per cent of them are American citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. And what about the rest of them?

Father KAZINCY. The rest are not.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what nationalities are they?

Father KAZINCY. Slovaks.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you taken out naturalization papers?

Father KAZINCY. Oh, yes; I am an old citizen.

Senator McKELLAR. And how about subscriptions to Liberty bonds and to the Red Cross?

Father KAZINCY. Well, 100 per cent of them bought.

Senator McKELLAR. You state that you are a Slovak?

Father KAZINCY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that over 50 per cent of your church are not American citizens?

Father KAZINCY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask you what you are doing—before you answer that, do they speak the English language?

Father KAZINCY. The most of them understand it. The conditions have been such that they are not very much inclined to stay in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the children educated in English?

Father KAZINCY. Practically in English, yes; and partly in Slavic. Partly in each. They now receive instructions in English.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you doing anything in the church, carrying on any work, to Americanize these men?

Father KAZINCY. Yes; I certainly am. I insist upon them taking out their citizens' papers, first of all, to pay their dues regularly and get the papers and get instructed in American ways and other things that they should do. We have an Americanization course in project taking place, and they have been instructed to go and attend those night schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are those schools carried on by?

Father KAZINCY. They are not a very great success, for the simple reason that the men are overworked, working from 10 to 13 hours a day; and they do not feel like going to the schools and depriving their family of their own company and society even after those hours, those long hours. Sundays, they have none, for most of them go off to work.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you noticed, in coming into contact with these men, any hostility upon their part toward the institutions of this country?

Father KAZINCY. Absolutely none. They have been branded as anarchists and Bolsheviks, and they resent it.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know whether there are any among them?

Father KAZINCY. No, they are Catholics, you know, and Catholics can not afford to do that unless they give up their religion.

Senator WALSH. Is it, or is it not, Father, a matter of excommunication from your church to be an anarchist or to teach anarchy?

Father KAZINCY. Not that I know of.

Senator WALSH. Is it not a matter of excommunication of your church to preach destruction of property?

Father KAZINCY. Not unless it is specific—unless the case had been proved to be such, and unless the sentence had been produced in such a way that it would fit their case.

Senator WALSH. If a man should admit that he was an anarchist and state that he was a Roman Catholic, is not that a matter that would lead to his excommunication?

Father KAZINCY. Not at all. It does not pertain to war. It is a political view which he can take upon himself in time of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. You started to tell us about the conditions there.

Father KAZINCY. The men are worked from 10 to 13 hours a day. You gentlemen will find that out if you will go to Braddock, and if you will accept me I will act as cicerone for you out there. The conditions under which they are living are bad for America. The housing conditions are terrible. The work conditions, the hours of work, are absolutely impossible, and I think that it tends to make the men become disgusted with the country, and they will say, "Well, let us go back to the old country; perhaps it is going to be better than it is for us here." There is no hope of them bettering their condition, for they work from the time the whistle begins to blow in the morning until they are whistled out at 6 o'clock in the morning; they must be at the gates there, and they have to work all the time. For instance, Mr. Gary has been quoted as saying that there are many millions of dollars put in the savings account. I would like to see him show us that money. It is the business class, the people in Johnstown and others. He says that he desires to have them have checking accounts. They do not have checking accounts. They do not believe in checking accounts. When they save a little money, they have the children, and they raise their children on bread and coffee, and they have to sustain themselves and their wives, and they have to be satisfied with their life.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that the living conditions are terrible. That is a conclusion. Let us know what you mean by that.

Father KAZINCY. The housing conditions, the hours of work, and the wage for the work, and the amount of the work.

Senator STERLING. Now, about the housing conditions, will you describe those?

Father KAZINCY. Well, two rooms, as a rule, are the headquarters of the workers. The lower part is a kitchen and upstairs is the living room, if you can call it such, and the sleeping room for the family, and they have to sleep there. Sometimes they have boarders and sometimes there are four or five sleeping in a room.

Senator STERLING. As a matter of fact, do many of them have less than four rooms?

Father KAZINCY. Yes; most of them have only two rooms.

Senator STERLING. Most of them have only two rooms?

Father KAZINCY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Have you visited other places than Braddock and made inquiries as to housing conditions?

Father KAZINCY. No; I have not.

Senator STERLING. Have you visited Homestead and Clairton?

Father KAZINCY. I have been there, and I have seen the United States Steel Corporation, if you will permit me, at my suggestion started the housing for their workmen with this result, that during the strike a certain man came to see me yesterday, John Zopach, and they had loaned him money, and he had been given a loan of \$1,234 from the company, like they loan the money to them for the purpose of purchasing a house for themselves. He had been informed by the company that unless he goes back to work his house is going to be sold. He lives at 20 Wood Street.

Senator STERLING. Now, will you return to my question? Have you any reason to believe that the housing conditions at Braddock are worse than they are at other places, such as Homestead and Clairton?

Father KAZINCY. I would not make any comparison.

Senator STERLING. You have not——

Father KAZINCY (interrupting). I would not make any comparison.

Senator STERLING. You have not made any investigation or any comparison?

Father KAZINCY. I will just say that they are very bad in Braddock.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of these cases where an employee has rented a house of four or five or even six rooms and then has relet part of the premises to somebody else? That has been done, hasn't it?

Father KAZINCY. That undoubtedly happens.

Senator STERLING. Don't you know of any instances of that kind, where the tenant has relet part of the premises to another family?

Father KAZINCY. In order to better his financial condition, I suppose. I have no doubt about that.

Senator STERLING. That is a very common practice?

Father KAZINCY. Yes; for the reason that they want to save up some more money.

The CHAIRMAN. How does these wages compare with the wages in the other industries there?

Father KAZINCY. They are 42 cents an hour up to 65 cents an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. And what are they in other industries there, outside of the steel industry?

Father KAZINCY. We have not another kind of industry in Braddock except those.

Senator PHIPPS. What are the common laborers paid?

Father KAZINCY. Forty-two cents an hour.

Senator PHIPPS. I mean those working on the streets, for instance.

Father KAZINCY. On the street?

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Father KAZINCY. I believe they get the same amount. I know that the police are getting 42 cents an hour, of course, standing around.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Father.

Father KAZINCY. Certainly.

**TESTIMONY OF P. H. BROGAN.**

(P. H. Brogan was called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Brogan, how old are you and what is your business?

Mr. BROGAN. I am 59 years old; I am now employed as secretary for the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. RUBIN. Where is your home?

Mr. BROGAN. My home is in Wilson, about a mile below North Clairton.

Mr. RUBIN. Now, on September 21 of this year, did you witness the tearing down of the American flag by troopers?

Mr. BROGAN. I did.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell us all about that. Tell us about it from the beginning to the end.

Mr. BROGAN. Well, we were holding a peaceful meeting, and one speaker had been up and spoke for several minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was this meeting?

Mr. BROGAN. At North Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were we yesterday?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; out a little piece from there, in some vacant lots that have never been used, and the streets have never been improved, and it is more of a pasture or field. The place was suggested by Burgess Thomas E. Williams, who is also a policeman for the Carnegie Steel Co. in the mill. He suggested this location. We held previous meetings on the same spot, and at this meeting, as I said, one speaker had finished, and the second speaker was up and had been talking for a few minutes, and everything was very quiet, very quiet, everybody attentive, listening to the speaker, with people all around, women, children, and old men, and all at once there was a commotion. I looked up and I saw the State constables coming riding in as fast as they could ride. They rode right in where the meeting was; it was packed with men, women, and little children. These constables were using their big long clubs, striking the people on both sides of their horses, cursing and swearing at the same time. Of course, that is all one, cursing and swearing.

The CHAIRMAN. How many were there?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, I did not hardly have time to count, but there were about five or six.

The CHAIRMAN. And how far away from them were you?

Mr. BROGAN. When I saw them I was probably 75 yards from the stand. They rode in there and battered a good many people over the head before they got in, and one man I thought was going to ride up on the stand. The stand is about a foot higher than the table, and I guess he saw he could not get up was the reason that he did not come up. That State constable rode up by the American flag and he grabbed the flag and threw it down in the mud, and directly he got off his horse and an old man, John Buzick—he is back here. He was told to get out, and he did not understand him. This man Corrigan hit him with his club over the head and cracked his head open. I wiped the blood off his head with the flag. The

State constables began shouting at them, "Get away from there." The newspapers said that we were going up a hill and throwing stones. It was a fill under the railroad track, and some of them did throw ashes. There is no brickbats there. There is not any there. It is filled up with coke dust. I saw that there was danger of them getting shot. I threw up my hands and hollered to the men, "Go home; go home or you will get shot." I hollered that a number of times. Corrigan turned around on his horse and took his gun and pointed it at me.

The CHAIRMAN. I am inexperienced with the swearing of witnesses. I will swear you now. I do not know as I swore you before you started to give your testimony.

(The chairman thereupon swore the witness.)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, all you have said heretofore you will consider as being under oath?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir. I helped them out, and he pointed his gun at me, and I threw up my hands and I told him to cut it out. He started to shoot at the other men. I do not know whether he shot anybody—

The CHAIRMAN. But did he actually shoot?

Mr. BROGAN. He emptied his gun a couple of times.

The CHAIRMAN. How many people were shot—how many people did you say there were there at the time he was shooting?

Mr. BROGAN. I have not said, but I suppose there were a couple of thousand or maybe more.

The CHAIRMAN. And he didn't hit anybody?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, he was shooting mostly at those who were on the side of the railroad company's right of way. There were a couple of thousand of people at the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he shooting at the people?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; those that were piling up trying to get away from him on the bank of the railroad.

Senator McKELLAR. He was not a very good shot, then, was he?

Mr. BROGAN. He was a good distance away, you know. He was too far away for them to throw any brickbats.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think that he was shooting to frighten them?

Mr. BROGAN. I could not tell.

Senator STERLING. How many shots were there?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, I told you that he emptied his gun a couple of times, probably 10 or 12 shots.

Senator STERLING. Did he have a six or a seven shooter?

Mr. BROGAN. I could not tell you that.

Senator STERLING. Nobody was hit?

Mr. BROGAN. Nobody was hit that I know of.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you recognize this constable and did you know his name?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir. Then they got in on the ground and they knocked down some women.

Senator PHIPPS. Are those women here?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir. One lady had a little baby in her arms, and he tramped on her wrist. The baby rolled down over the bank.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you see that?

Mr. BROGAN. I did not see it, but I have got the lady here.

Mr. RUBIN. He is telling what he first saw, and I have the witnesses to corroborate him.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you want of this gentleman [indicating a bystander]?

Mr. BROGAN. This gentleman [indicating] was standing alongside the lady. This gentleman had a flag that was torn down. Well, they arrested those people and they battered them over the heads, and they took them all away to the lockup. I was put in the lockup with the others, and we remained there from about 3 o'clock, I think, until, I think, it was about 9 o'clock, without anything to eat. Then we were taken to Pittsburgh, and we wanted the constable to allow us to buy something, but he would not give permission. I believe that Mr. Brennen put up the bail and everything—\$1,000. That describes our meeting as well as I can, I believe. We had another meeting that was broken up after that.

Senator McKELLAR. Tell us about that.

Mr. BROGAN. On about, I think it was the 2d of August, we were holding a meeting on my lot, my property, and one speaker had been up speaking about three minutes, and everything was all right, and the constables came along—everything was quiet—and the constables came and arrested seven of us, and they locked us up in Clairton. There was a forfeit put up for each man, I think \$10 or \$15. I did not put it up, and I did not see the man. We had a hearing by policeman—burgess—that is, I do not know what to call him, whether to call him policeman or burgess; he is both. Well, it came up in court, and that is all I know that became of it. The judges, like the business people around Clairton, appear to be afraid to give a decision. Now, I don't know as there is anything else that I can give you.

Mr. RUBIN. Do you want this witness to testify about working conditions and wages?

Mr. BROGAN. I was employed in the mill, and I drove the first nail in the building.

Mr. RUBIN. How long since?

Mr. BROGAN. The 26th of April, 1916—that is, the by-products mill. From the 24th of November.

Mr. RUBIN. What year?

Mr. BROGAN. Of 1918. I was off from the 20th to the 24th; my step-son died. From the 24th of November until the 30th of June. I had been off three days. One day I simply would not work. It was the Fourth of July, and two days I got permission to be off.

Senator PHIPPS. This year?

Mr. BROGAN. No; 1919. Now, I worked 10½ hours in the daytime and 13½ and 14 hours—everybody works 14 hours at night. When Mr. Gary claims that it is a 10-hour day, it is a 14-hour night.

Mr. RUBIN. How about Sunday?

Mr. BROGAN. Sunday and every other day. There is no such thing as getting off. I was running electric booms over by machinery. They shut one of them down for a minute and it would cause trouble all over the plant. If it was shut down just for a minute, it would cause trouble, because they would cool off the gas that went into what they called the scrapers, where the coke goes in. It was considered one of the most important jobs there. I got 49 cents an hour.



As far as I can say, the skilled mechanics get about—well, anywhere from 50 to 61 to 65 cents an hour. The same man can get about 90 cents outside.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you paid time and a half for overtime?

Mr. BROGAN. That is only—

Senator McKELLAR. There seems to be some question as to whether they were or not, and that is the reason I am asking you. Were you paid time and a half for overtime?

Mr. BROGAN. They have a rule here to abide the eight-hour system, as far as I can understand, that they would pay time and a half for over eight hours. They work eight hours and they continue to work you at time and a half after that, but that is not what the men want. It is not what I wanted.

Senator McKELLAR. Some of the men said that they did not get time and a half for overtime?

Mr. BROGAN. That may be. I could not say what others do, but I want, and what the majority wants, is to get less than a 14-hour day. A man is not physically strong enough to work 14 hours each day or each night. Nobody is. And that is what the men here are fighting for, that is what they want, and what they are fighting for, and they will continue that fight until the men get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you say that you are working 14 hours nights?

Mr. BROGAN. Some of them work 13½ hours nights and 10 hours in the daytime, and some work 10 hours in the day time and 14 hours at night.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the things you are fighting against?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; that, I think, is the most important thing of all, and also to get the union recognized, so that we can have somebody that can talk to the bosses.

The CHAIRMAN. And what else is it that you are fighting for?

Mr. BROGAN. We want enough money to live on and we want an eight-hour day.

Senator McKELLAR. When you work 14 hours a day you get paid for 17 hours?

Mr. BROGAN. We get time and a half after we work eight hours.

Senator McKELLAR. That would be 17 hours if you worked 14 hours a day?

Mr. BROGAN. No. I do not think I could make you understand it. If two men are working on a job they each get 12 hours, even though one works 12 hours and the other 14. That figures 12 hours apiece, and they work that way for two weeks. Then the next week they shift over again. The man that works the short hours gets as much as the man who works the long hours.

Senator McKELLAR. You alternate by weeks?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; and that is an agreement between the men, the company says.

Senator PHIPPS. You made one statement there in reference to the time of employment from May 24, 1918, as I got it, up to June 30, 1919. You made reference to the Fourth of July, and you said that you would not work on the Fourth of July. You were referring to the preceding July Fourth, were you not? I do not want to take advantage of you—

Mr. BROGAN. I was employed on the 26th of April, 1916, but as I went on to explain, I had not lost any time but three days from the 24th of November, when my stepson died, until the day I was discharged, and two of the days I got off for business, and one day, as I said, was the Fourth of July.

Senator PHIPPS. I was afraid that the record would read in a way that was not intelligent to the committee.

Mr. BROGAN. I worked seven days a week.

Senator PHIPPS. In the three years?

Mr. BROGAN. No; I am speaking of the last six or seven months. I say that I changed jobs. I was first a carpenter, and then I was a fireman, and the last job I had was running these pumps.

The CHAIRMAN. And when did that end?

Mr. BROGAN. On the 30th of June I was discharged.

Senator PHIPPS. Why were you discharged?

Mr. BROGAN. I was discharged because I joined the union.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that the reason given you for your discharge?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir—joining the union?

Senator PHIPPS. Was that the reason given you for your discharge?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, the boss over me came to me and he said: "Brogan, I have bad news." I said, "What is it?" He said, "I hate to tell this. I really hate to tell." I said, "Go ahead." He said, "I am going to let you out." I said, "How is that? Why?" "I have got too many men," he said. "Well, in point of service, I am the oldest man in the mill. I drove the first nail that started to build it." He says, "I can not help it. That comes from a power higher up."

Senator PHIPPS. Did he tell you that you had been charged with having been under the influence of liquor; that that was the reason they let you out?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir; I have not taken a drop of liquor since the 13th day of March, 1915. I will explain that a little later on. I want to explain me a little later on. When he told men that I was going to be discharged, I asked him if I could see Mr. Miller, the superintendent of motive power. He said, "He is down about the plants now and he won't be back much—he won't be back in a couple of hours." I says, "I will go there and see him." Well, I went and saw him, and I said, "Well, I got your notice. I am discharged, Mr. Miller?" "Yes." I said, "How does it come that you pick on me when there is so many new men here, men who have come in here lately?" He said, "That is the way of it. There is no argument about it."

I said a while back that I wanted to give you a little information about the drinking question. When I went there to get employment Capt. Bowen, one of the greatest drinkers in Clairton, chief of police for the mill company—after I had gotten employment I had gone out and went to work, and I was held up because I did not have a card, and it caused me a little trouble. I went up to see what the trouble was and they did not care to tell me at first. Capt. Bowen was also at the head of the employment office at Clairton at the time and finally I persuaded him to tell me. He said that Mr. Vonolds, superintendent of construction, said, "You are charged with being a booze hoister." That was a surprise to me. He said, "You had better go up and get it fixed up."

I went up to Squire Morrow's office and I wrote out a statement and made oath to it that I had not taken a drop of liquor since, I think, 1915, the 13th of March. And right in below that I wrote that I would give any man \$100 that could prove anything to the contrary, and I took that in to Capt. Bowen. He said, "That is very good. That is what I want. You were reported down at the other officer—it was reported that you were a booze hoister." I said, "That is a nice shape to put me in, keep me out of a job, when I can not go to work." He said that he did not do it. He told me the superintendent had told him. I went back and I took my card and I went to the superintendent of construction. He was out on the job, and I said that I will come in at noon and we will clear it up to-day. After he came back, after dinner, I came there and I did not get a chance to speak to him. He says, "Go on; that is all right."

Mr. RUBIN. Wait a minute. How about the meetings? Were there any meetings?

Mr. BROGAN. I want to state a word about Capt. Bowen. It is important. He is the captain of all of the mill police, and at one of the meetings we were having he came down there and he was so drunk that he actually had to be carried through the crowd and put in his automobile. He sat there for half an hour. The steel company sent a bunch of spies out to the meeting, and one of the superintendents, Jake was his name, was that drunk that he could not stand up, and he went up on the hillside and he went to sleep.

Mr. RUBIN. How about meetings? Were there any meetings allowed?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir; we are not allowed to have any meetings there.

Mr. RUBIN. Of any kind?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Any meetings—not even a union meeting?

Mr. BROGAN. Not even a union meeting.

Mr. RUBIN. What can you say in regard to the members of your union having subscribed for Liberty bonds and for the Red Cross?

Mr. BROGAN. We have all subscribed so far as I know. I have got a \$500 bond with two payments made on it already and a \$600.

Mr. RUBIN. Is there any Bolshevism or I. W. W.'s among the men there?

Mr. BROGAN. I never met any Bolshevists or I. W. W.'s or anarchists in all my life anywhere.

Mr. RUBIN. Are there any such—is there any such talk among the men down there?

Mr. BROGAN. No; I have never heard any of it.

Mr. RUBIN. Now, gentlemen, I have brought here several witnesses—

Senator PHIPPS (interrupting). I understand that you are an American citizen?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir. I was born 3 miles from there.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you own your own property?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you a man with a family?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What have you been doing since you were out of the mills?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, I was going to build a little addition to my house, and there were some repairs around my house that I was going to do. I was going to do some more, but since Mr. Foster asked me if I could find him a hall—he asked me if I could find him a hall. I did find a hall, and Mr. Foster came out and he paid a month's rent on it. Mr. Foster sent out and started the union headquarters, and a policeman that they call Slim in Wilson—there was a notice, and he tore that notice down. The steel company——

Senator WALSH. Did you see this man tear it down?

Mr. BROGAN. No; I did not.

Senator WALSH. Then that is hearsay?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; but it is torn down all right. I was out passing bills, and I was arrested for passing bills.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been your employment since you have been out of the mills? Have you been working for anybody?

Mr. BROGAN. I was going to say that the first 28 days that I was out that I worked around my own home, and Mr. Foster asked me to take this secretary job out there for the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that what you call it, organizing?

Mr. BROGAN. I do not know whether you call it organizer or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you on a salary?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; I work by the day for them.

Senator STERLING. How much do you get?

Mr. BROGAN. \$8 a day.

Senator STERLING. Do you not get any more than \$8 a day?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Don't you get so much for each man that you get into the union?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir; I do not.

Senator STERLING. You just simply get \$8 a day?

Mr. BROGAN. I get \$8 a day.

Senator STERLING. When were you discharged?

Mr. BROGAN. The 30th day of June of last year was the last day that I worked.

Senator STERLING. 1919?

Mr. BROGAN. 1919; yes.

Senator STERLING. Have you been receiving \$8 a day since that time?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir; since about the 28th day of July.

Senator STERLING. From about the 28th day of July?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you are getting that pay now?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What wages were you getting when you were discharged from the mill?

Mr. BROGAN. I was getting 49 cents an hour.

Senator STERLING. And you were working how many hours?

Mr. BROGAN. I worked in the daytime 10½ hours, and in the night-time I worked 15½ hours.

Senator STERLING. And you were getting 49 cents an hour for the first eight hours and time and a half——

Mr. BROGAN. For four hours.

Senator STERLING. And when you were working 10 hours——

Mr. BROGAN. Then I got the other fellow's two hours.

Senator STERLING. You got time and a half, didn't you?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. For the two hours over the eight hours?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And when you were working 14 hours you got time and a half for six hours?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir; only for two hours.

Senator STERLING. Just for two hours?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, we got it for four hours. I made a mistake. Both day and night we got the time for eight hours and time and a half for four hours, we got it the same for the day as we did for the night. The man does not get any more hours than the day man, although he works longer.

Senator STERLING. And what do your wages, in dollars and cents, amount to when you are working 10 hours?

Mr. BROGAN. To \$6.84, it is figured.

Senator STERLING. And when you are working longer time?

Mr. BROGAN. I did not understand that first.

Senator STERLING. How much in dollars and cents did you get when you were working 10 hours a day?

Mr. BROGAN. I did not work 10 hours a day.

Senator STERLING. I thought you said you were working 10 hours a day?

Mr. BROGAN. We worked 10½ hours a day.

Senator STERLING. And how much in dollars and cents did you get?

Mr. BROGAN. We got two hours that belonged to the other fellow. If I can make you understand that——

Senator STERLING. Then you were paid regularly—your regular pay was \$6.84 a day?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; for 12 hours.

Senator WALSH. What is the name of the union that you belong to?

Mr. BROGAN. I belong to the American Federation of Labor.

Senator WALSH. But what is the branch organization?

Mr. BROGAN. The branch?

Senator WALSH. Do you belong to a union now?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And by what local name is it known?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, we have not got a local formed there as yet, you know. We have not got a local there yet. We tried to get one, but we could not get a hall.

Senator WALSH. How many members have you in the union at the present time?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, indeed, I could not tell you, for the reason that they were sending our applications in to Mr. Foster and he files them away in with some others, along with some of the others, and I could not tell you the exact number.

Senator WALSH. Approximately, there are some thousands—do you say that there are some thousands?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. When was this union organized?

Mr. BROGAN. We were organized—we were organizing it right along.

Senator WALSH. You say that you were discharged on June 30?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. For being a member of a union?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Then it must have been created before that time?

Mr. BROGAN. We had begun to take out cards.

Senator WALSH. And when did you join the union?

Mr. BROGAN. About the 2d, I think, of February. I sent in my application to the city office.

Senator WALSH. And what union is it that you joined?

Mr. BROGAN. The American Federation of Labor.

Senator WALSH. Did it have any branch name or local name?

Mr. BROGAN. No.

Mr. RUBIN. Perhaps I can explain. They had been sending in their applications, and were to be segregated into various branches, but because they could not—they were not permitted to have meetings—they could not segregate them.

Senator WALSH. And all that you had done, then, was to join the union—and all you have to do is by sending in your card and to get others to do the same thing, and you have had no meetings up to date?

Mr. BROGAN. No; only under closed doors. I think we did.

Senator WALSH. And how did you take the strike vote?

Mr. BROGAN. We gave each man a blank about this size [illustrating], and he was to put a X here [indicating], "Yes" or "No." It read something like this; it was left up to him: "If you want the demands put a X after the yes; if you don't want them put a X after the no."

The CHAIRMAN. How many languages were that book printed in?

Mr. BROGAN. Four or five; I did not know how many different languages.

Senator WALSH. Who collected those votes?

Mr. BROGAN. They brought them into the office.

Senator WALSH. Have you an office in this community?

Mr. BROGAN. We have up there a little bit of an office, about 10 feet square.

Senator WALSH. In what plant, in connection with what plant, is that union that you are soliciting members for? What is the name of the plant?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, there is three separate plants up there, three plants, the Carnegie Steel Co., the Morris & Bailey, and Monongahela Tube.

Senator WALSH. And are all of them parts of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. BROGAN. No.

Senator WALSH. What of them are with the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. BROGAN. The two plants—the one, whatever you want to call it, the Clairton mill, and the by-product—whether you call it one plant or two.

Senator WALSH. Has there been any separation of the union members of these plants? Have they been separated into groups at all yet?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir; they have not.

Senator WALSH. You say that you have been prevented from holding meetings?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. That is a very important statement, and I want to ask you a few questions and see just how much personal knowledge you have about it. You say that you hired a hall?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. And you put a sign outside?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. And it was removed?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Did anybody stop you or anybody else from going into that hall?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes; the company's agent told me that if I bothered that hall that I would have trouble, and he weighs about 250 pounds.

Senator WALSH. What is his name?

Mr. BROGAN. I have not got his name. He is a foreigner that I have seen around up there.

Senator WALSH. Can you furnish us his name?

Mr. BROGAN. I could.

Senator WALSH. What is his position with the company?

Mr. BROGAN. He gathers up men when they are short of men. He is probably interested in some of their commissaries and speak-easies up there.

Senator WALSH. What did he say to you?

Mr. BROGAN. I did not want to talk to him at all. The last time he talked at me, and I went into the squire's and burgess's office at Wilson. The police was standing in there and one of the State constables, and I said, "This man is bothering me, and I want you to protect me." I was talking to the burgess and the chief of police and the State constable.

Senator WALSH. What had he said to you before that?

Mr. BROGAN. That he and I would have trouble if I undertook to use that hall.

Senator WALSH. That happened in the magistrate's office?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, they did not pay much attention to me.

Senator WALSH. You say that he said that you would have trouble. Did you use the hall?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. And did you give up the hall?

Mr. BROGAN. We had to give it up.

Senator WALSH. You gave it up, did you?

Mr. BROGAN. No; we did not. They had our \$40 rent on it.

Senator WALSH. And is that all you know about the hall, that this man approached you and said that you had to give it up?

Mr. BROGAN. No; he did not say that I had to give it up. He said, "If you go around there you are going to have trouble."

Senator WALSH. And you say that you were peddling bills?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Announcing the organization of a union?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir; that we were going to have a meeting.

Senator WALSH. And you were arrested?

Mr. BROGAN. I was arrested; yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. By whom?

Mr. BROGAN. By Mr. Young, the chief of police in Clairton.

Senator WALSH. Where were you at the time you were arrested?

Mr. BROGAN. I was within 100 yards of getting out of Clairton borough, right in front of the main office of the steel company in Clairton.

Senator WALSH. And what were you charged with?

Mr. BROGAN. With passing bills.

Senator WALSH. Were you charged with a violation of an ordinance, a city ordinance, which prohibits bill distributing in Clairton, or otherwise?

Mr. BROGAN. It prevented me—the next day I was along there, and I showed it to the police—another man was handing out bills, and they did not prevent him. I showed it to the police, and he said that it was all right.

Senator WALSH. What kind of bill was that?

Mr. BROGAN. It was a bill in regard to goods in a store.

Senator WALSH. And you claim a discrimination was made in the administration of the law?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Because you were peddling bills relative to a labor meeting and you were arrested, while a merchant was distributing bills and he was not arrested?

Mr. BROGAN. That is right.

Senator WALSH. The meeting where there was some shooting, was that a labor meeting?

Mr. BROGAN. That was a union meeting. It was held by the union.

Senator WALSH. What date was that?

Mr. BROGAN. That was on the 21st of September.

Senator WALSH. Of this year?

Mr. BROGAN. Of this year.

Senator WALSH. The day before the strike?

Mr. BROGAN. The day before the strike.

Senator WALSH. Was there any noise or disturbance of any kind there at that meeting?

Mr. BROGAN. No; not at all, but the constables rode right in there. It was much more quiet than it is here now, because there are no street cars up there passing by.

Senator WALSH. Is there any reason that you can give us for them coming in there?

Mr. BROGAN. Not unless the steel company had instructed them to do that.

Senator WALSH. Have you given us all of the evidence that you can produce showing the restrictions of the rights of holding meetings and passing bills or the hiring of halls? Have you covered the whole ground?

Mr. RUBIN. You understand the question. Have any meetings been permitted to be held?



Mr. BROGAN. Well, we have a meeting at large in the township, and he follows us out there, the constables and the mill officials, and I am not sure whether the police from Clairton were there or not. He had permission to hold the meeting out there from the school board, in this school and we also had permission from Squire Green, and we were under the protection of the deputy sheriff, but the constables came out there and rode up and down the streets and told the people—it is a little village out there, a mining village, and the people were sitting on the front porch—and he drove the women and children in off of their front porches, and they made them go into the house, and when we applied to get permission to hold another meeting we were informed by the school directors that we could not get it on account of the way the constables had treated the women out there.

Senator WALSH. What date was that?

Mr. BROGAN. That meeting—let's see. It was about three weeks ago.

Senator McKELLAR. About what proportion of the strikers in Clairton are Americans and what proportion are foreigners?

Mr. BROGAN. The greatest proportion are foreigners, because the greatest proportion out there, before there was any strikers was foreigners, and naturally the bigger proportion of the strikers would be foreigners now. But there are—pretty much all of the Americans employed there are bosses and clerks and they hold easy jobs, and they can stand these long hours, because they can go and take a snooze once in a while. The foreigners have to do the heavy, hard work, and they can not stand up to it like a man taking a sleep every 3 or 4 hours.

Senator McKELLAR. Most of the Americans are still at work and most of the foreigners are on strike?

Mr. BROGAN. I believe that is about the way of it; that is, of the Carnegie Mills, but down at the Morris & Bailey mills and the Monongahela Tube there is more Americans in either of those mills than there are foreigners; and in the Monongahela Tube have never made any attempt to try to run. They are all out on strike. Mr. Harry Davis, in Morris & Bailey's, Mr. Harry Davis came down, and I says "Boys, there is something doing." About the next day they had a bunch of his clerks out trying to gather up men to get some smoke started in there. They got a little smoke started up—

Senator McKELLAR. How do the men get along with their bosses? You spoke of bosses. Do you mean the superintendents over them? Are they treated well by their bosses?

Mr. BROGAN. The men?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BROGAN. Well, I will tell you. Under the system, the present system, a man has no show at all for his rights.

Where I was working the man who discharged me had either three or four brothers come there, and they was working under him, and they got more money than I was getting, and they had not been there over—more than three or four months, while I started with the plant itself. If you stand in with the boss, if you pay him something, or if you give him booze or something like that, then you can get a good job.

Senator McKELLAR. Can you get booze up there now?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, the mill companies have been keeping their commissaries inside of the mill yards for the last three or four years. You can get a meal ticket and you can get booze on it.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they still sell booze now?

Mr. BROGAN. Like yesterday, the policeman used to wear a belt and guns, but when you fellows came up there, they hid them.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that true of the State constabulary?

Mr. BROGAN. I am talking about the mill policemen, inside of the mill there. The State constables went in the hills yesterday and hid.

Senator McKELLAR. I understand that there has been some violence but that no one has been hurt?

Mr. BROGAN. No one hurt? Let me bring some up and show you.

Senator McKELLAR. How many were hurt—were many hurt?

Mr. BROGAN. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. How many?

Mr. BROGAN. There were so many with their heads battered up and—

Mr. RUBIN. We have got some of them here.

The CHAIRMAN. The mayor is here to give some testimony, and I would like to have him testify before we adjourn.

Mr. RUBIN. I want to put into the record the names of witnesses who can testify to like instances, without calling the witnesses.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Brogan, I want to ask one or two questions.

Did the bills which you were peddling announce the object of the meeting?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, they read something like this: "There will be a mass meeting of—there will be a union mass meeting of steel workers"—

Senator STERLING. Have you got one of them with you?

Mr. BROGAN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did they announce the purpose of the meeting, that it was for the purpose of forming a local union?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, I do not remember now.

Senator STERLING. Now, is it not a fact, Mr. Brogan, that it did not announce, did it, that it was the purpose of the meeting to form a local union? I would like the witness to answer that question. Did or did not these bills—or does he know whether on these bills there was an announcement of the purpose of the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Please answer the question.

Mr. BROGAN. I can not remember what was on those bills.

Senator STERLING. At whose instance were the bills printed? Did you have those bills printed?

Mr. BROGAN. No. They were printed by order from the city officer, who sent them there. I came in for them.

Senator STERLING. You know, do you not, as a matter of fact, that the bills did not state on their face that the purpose of the meeting was to form a local union?

Mr. BROGAN. No; I do not know about that, either, now.

Senator STERLING. Were not, as a matter of fact, were not all public meetings prohibited?

Mr. BROGAN. No.

Senator STERLING. They were not?

Mr. BROGAN. No; and they are not to-day; public meetings are not prohibited from anybody but us. I talked to this policeman, Burgess Thomas Williams, not very long ago, and he says, "I have not got the authority to either stop or give you permission"—but he stops them all right.

Mr. RUBIN. Those bills are merely to call a mass meeting, and they come from the officer of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. What duty do you do—and whatever you do it is under the orders of Mr. Foster?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, members or anything like that.

The CHAIRMAN. And you report to Mr. Foster what you do?

Mr. BROGAN. No; I know what I am to do, so far as writing them up.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you get any instructions from Mr. Foster what to do?

Mr. BROGAN. Well, sometimes I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he the one directly over you, directing what you do?

Mr. BROGAN. No; there is several. Here is Mr. Brown and sometimes I see him, and others I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Mr. Brown's position?

Mr. RUBIN. He is an organizer, and he is trying to take care of the people that are arrested.

### TESTIMONY OF E. V. BABCOCK.

E. V. Babcock was called as a witness, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Babcock, you are mayor of the city of Pittsburgh?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And, of course, this strike matter has come under your observation, officially and otherwise?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee would be glad to have you go ahead and tell them what you know about it, in your own way, and especially as to order or disorder.

Mr. BABCOCK. My main interest in this strike is to keep order and peace in the city. We have not experienced difficulty since the strike started. I think we have had remarkably good order from the very beginning of the strike up to the present time.

A good deal of the credit for the good order is due to the men themselves. They have assured us that they would keep order; and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, they have carried that assurance out.

We fortified ourselves to keep peace and order in case they did not, and in case there was any disturbance; we increased our police force and arranged that they should devote very much of the time in the districts where the disorder might take place, but up to this time we have experienced no disorder of—not worth speaking of. Now, I am speaking in the city limits.

Senator STERLING. Are there any plants in the city limits where the strike is now going on?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, many.

Senator STERLING. Name one some of the larger ones; about how many?

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, I don't know as I know exactly what you mean by "strike going on," but there are three or four Steel Corporation plants in the Lawrenceville district, and some in the Woods Lane district on the North Side; and some out in the Hazelwood district on Second Avenue, the National Tube plant and the Jones & Laughlin plant, etc. There must be 6 or 8 or 10 plants in the city that we kept our eye on, for if there would be trouble it would be at those plants.

Senator McKELLAR. Has there been any trouble?

Mr. BABCOCK. No.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know, Mr. Mayor, what proportion of the men who went out on strike to begin with have gone back to work?

Mr. BABCOCK. No; I do not know the exact proportion, but the men have been flowing back to a considerable extent from the first, and especially after the beginning of the second week.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. BABCOCK. Just how many men went out I do not know and just how many of them have gone back I do not know, and just how many men are still out I do not know.

Senator STERLING. Have any of the mills in the district suspended operations?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think not. They may be partially suspended, but I know of no plant that was shut down in the city at any time during the strike. I get my information, the information that I am trying to give you, from that given to the police department. We have had our superintendent of police visit all of these districts every morning, starting out at 5 o'clock in the morning and going from plant to plant and getting in something like 9 o'clock, and watching the morning shifts, seeing that the men were placed around where he wanted them and attending to their business.

Senator STERLING. And there was no violence or disorder in the city, you say?

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, there might have been some little bits of noises in relieving the men.

Mr. RUBIN. I would like to have the Senators ask the Mayor why it was that, with all of this peace and order, why he had arbitrarily issued an order that hereafter no meetings of the men or the strikers can be held at any place other than at Labor Temple, which is not large enough to accommodate the strikers, and one other small hall, a distance away, where—a long distance away from where they live—and denied the right to hold meetings elsewhere.

Mr. BABCOCK. It is not the intention or the policy of the city administration to deny these men meetings. It has not been. It has not been our policy to deny them or anybody else meetings. We have given permits to have meetings on the south side close to the Jones & Laughlin mills, and in the Lawrenceville district, and in the Labor Temple, and on the north side.

As this condition grew more intense, the police authorities—the chief of police and the director of public safety—thought it was better

to discontinue meetings on the south side and in the Lawrenceville district, and recommended that the workmen should have their meetings in the Labor Temple, which is really the biggest hall in the city, a very commodious hall.

The CHAIRMAN. How many will it hold?

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, I attended one meeting during the street car strike, of the strikers there, and they said there were about 3,000 in the room. It was overpacked, congested beyond measure, but it will hold 1,500 or 2,000 people at one time in that big auditorium room. It is one of the biggest rooms in the city, and very centrally located, a couple of blocks from where you are sitting and from all of the down-town manufacturing districts; and it is about as near the center as any hall we have in the city.

The police department did give them a further permit for north-side meetings in a part of the city where there are no mills. It is not so very far from the mill district on the north side over the river. I do not know exactly where the meeting place is.

There was one reason that was potent in deciding when these men asked me to allow these meetings to be held, when they were denied, and that is the chief of police and the department of public safety and the mayor—there were a great many complaints from the residents about these particular places coming into the police department, saying that they were afraid and asking us to discontinue those meetings there, from people that lived there, Americans or foreigners that had been there so long that they are Americans and are regular residents of the vicinity. They complained, and their many complaints came to the chief of police about it. I do not think it is very harmful to the men to have their meetings confined to these two places now.

Senator STERLING. Considering the fact, Mr. Mayor, that there was this general strike on, and considering these things, these complaints that came from these districts, would you regard it as any more than the exercise of reasonable care and caution to restrict the places in which these meetings might be held?

Mr. BABCOCK. That is the ground on which we did it. I told the men when they appeared before me that my position was entirely neutral. I would not take sides with either side, the steel manufacturers or the men, either; and that I was mayor of them all; and that I wanted to be fair to them all; and I held to that position fearlessly.

Senator PHIPPS. You referred to a street car strike. Was that a recent occurrence?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Was there any difficulty in handling the situation at the time? Was there any violence then?

Mr. BABCOCK. We had an incipient riot on Fifth Avenue, but it was not very serious. There was not \$100 worth of property destroyed in the city. It was the result of a spontaneous meeting that grew up in the street of curiosity seekers that flocked out on the streets from the office buildings, and they were the mischief-makers; there were the newsboys and boys of that kind. I do not think the strikers were represented in the meeting on the street at all; but there was a big crowd gathered on the street—gathered in an

instant; so quickly that our mounted police, who were a half a block away, could not get away and get there.

Senator McKELLAR. Have there been any strikers arrested since the strike began?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. To what extent?

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not know the actual number. I am speaking for Pittsburgh only.

Senator McKELLAR. Has there been any strikers intimidated by having some of their people arrested—

Mr. BABCOCK. I think not.

Mr. RUBIN. I would like to have the Senators ask the mayor another question: Why, in view of the fact that he admitted that the meetings were orderly, and the labor leaders had offered to assist in the matter of policing, and had offered even to reimburse the city for any police that might be furnished, why he denied them the right to hold meetings when they—and they had advised the men to travel by street cars to go to the halls—when the halls can only accommodate 2,000 when filled, when there are 15,000 out on strike in the city of Pittsburgh?

Mr. BABCOCK. I can only repeat what I said before, that the controlling and potent reasons for refusing a permit for the two buildings was because of the serious complaints that came in quite large numbers into the police department and into the headquarters from the residents in the districts. These meetings were held in the vicinity of the plants where contests were going on; and, naturally—if you question about miles; it is not miles from the South Side headquarters to your labor temple, and it is a short distance, and a man can walk over there; the men can walk if they want to, and it is a convenient place to get to from the Lawrenceville district.

Senator PHIPPS. And did your experience with the street car strike influence you at all in declining to give further permits for the meetings during this present strike?

Mr. BABCOCK. Only to this extent, that we were quite unprepared when the street car strike took place, and we took every precaution this time to meet any contingency that we might have to face. Of course, this whole thing had a bearing, the street car strike would have had a bearing on not granting these permits, because we thought that was an additional precaution to keep peace and order, and nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Mayor.

### TESTIMONY OF MRS. MARY DOLINSKY.

Mrs. MARY DOLINSKY was thereupon produced as a witness, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

Mr. RUBIN. What is your name?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Mrs. Mary Dolinsky.

Mr. RUBIN. How many children have you?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Four.

Mr. RUBIN. And on that Sunday, September 21, were you at that meeting?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir; I was not. I was not at the meeting.

Mr. RUBIN. Where was you?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. I was at home.

Mr. RUBIN. How far is your home from the meeting?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. My home is up on a hill and this was down like this [indicating].

Mr. RUBIN. What happened to you that day?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Nothing happened to me until the 22d.

Mr. RUBIN. What happened to you on the 22d?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Well, I went out on the porch, and I was out there, and a woman hollered to me, "Your man is getting clubbed." I ran down to where he was, and I could not tell whether it was my man or not, he was bleeding so hard, and the State police he pointed at me—he pointed a gun at me—and he told me to get away from there, and I hollered, "Don't kill my man." He just pointed at me—he pointed a gun at me—and my mother said, "No, it is not your man," and I went back home and I didn't bother them any more.

The CHAIRMAN. In what mill does your husband work?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. In the Steel Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it your husband?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No; it wasn't him; they just hollered that it was my man, and I did not know whether it was or not, and I ran down, and I couldn't tell whether it was my man or not, he was bleeding so, and they hollered for me to go, and I ran down, and I did not know whether it was my man or not.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you saw this man that had been clubbed?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; I saw this man that had been clubbed, he was by a wagon well, and they were rubbing him, and the police told me to go away, and they pointed a gun at me. I hollered, "Don't kill my man," and my mother came back there for me.

Senator PHIPPS. Where was this place?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. It was on Second Street in Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. And you husband was working in that mill, was he?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he working in there now?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you born in this country, Mrs. Dolinsky?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes, sir; I was.

The CHAIRMAN. And was your husband born in this country?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was he born?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Austria-Hungary.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a citizen of the United States?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long has he been here, do you know?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. About 11 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Has he got out his first papers?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Has he ever talked about becoming a citizen of the United States?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why has he not become a citizen of the United States?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. He has not had a chance to go ahead and to learn to speak very good English and he can not get out them papers. Then, too, he never had anyone to go with him.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you ever speak English in your home?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; we talk to our children.

Senator McKELLAR. Are your parents living in the United States? Were you born in the United States?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you want your husband to become an American citizen?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; I want him to become an American citizen, and I have two brothers that served in France for the United States.

Senator McKELLAR. How many days does your husband work each week?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Twelve hours a day.

Senator McKELLAR. And does he work Sundays, too?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. He works Sundays, too; yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What does he get?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. He gets \$6.06 for 12 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you do for amusement? Do you go to the movies and take the children?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No; I do not take them to the movies.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any recreation or amusement?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. At home?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You work how many hours yourself?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. I work all day and I do not get through.

Senator PHIPPS. And your husband works Sundays, does he?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Does he work there every Sunday? Doesn't he get off any Sunday?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Well, on one Sunday he is on the day turn and the next Sunday he is on the night turn.

Senator PHIPPS. Does he get off any other day during the week?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir; he does not get off any other day during the week.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you able to get along and to save up any money?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No; I have not saved up any money because I have my home furnished pretty well.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the ages of your children?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. The boy, he will be 8 years in December.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are living—how are you living now?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Well, we are living all right.

The CHAIRMAN. And is your husband working?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you some money saved?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Well, very few have any money saved.

The CHAIRMAN. And then what is it that you are living on? Are you living on the money that you have saved?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; on the money we have saved.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you get any strike benefits?



Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir; I have not.

Senator STERLING. How many rooms have you in your house?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. We have a house and five rooms.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you see the man clubbed, or did they strike him where you saw him?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; they had him down by the wagon and they were clubbing him.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of them were clubbing him?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. One of them was clubbing him, and he pointed a gun at me.

Senator McKELLAR. Did they club him hard? Did they make him bleed?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; they made him bleed. I could not see what face he had, he was bleeding so hard.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your husband tell you why he was striking?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. My husband told me why he was striking. He said he was satisfied with everything.

The CHAIRMAN. Your husband said he was?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he tell you why he quit the work?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Well, he said that everybody else went out and he went out, too.

The CHAIRMAN. He went out because the others went out, is that it?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And he said that he was satisfied there?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. He said that he was satisfied pretty well. He didn't say anything about—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, were you satisfied for him to go out?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; I was satisfied for him to go out. I didn't have any kick.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you wonder why he was quitting the work?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; I was wondering why the people quit the work, but I did not say anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he complain about his hours being too long?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Yes; he worked pretty hard there, all of the workmen did, and he would see other men that were getting better treated than he, and he was working pretty long.

Senator STERLING. What kind of work was he doing?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. He oils the engines in the blow room.

Senator McKELLAR. But you have to work longer hours than he, don't you, Mrs. Dolinsky, with four children?

Senator WALSH. What rent do you pay for the five rooms?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. We pay \$16 a month.

Senator WALSH. Is there a bathroom in the house?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You had better put in the record the ages of the children?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. One is eight; on December 29 he will be eight, and the second will be—was six in June, June the 8th, and the third will be five November 1, and the baby is three months and one week.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any of your children go to school?

Mrs. DOLINSKY. Two of them go to school; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that that is all.

## TESTIMONY OF MARY WICKKOWICZ.

Mrs. Mary Wickkowitz was thereupon produced as a witness and having been duly sworn testified as follows:

(Testimony taken through an interpreter.)

The CHAIRMAN. What country is she from?

Mrs. WICKKOWICZ. Serbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is her husband a Servian?

Mrs. WICKKOWICZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And is he an American citizen?

Mrs. WICKKOWICZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When was he naturalized?

Mrs. WICKKOWICZ. Do you mean when he got his citizenship papers?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mrs. WICKKOWICZ. Seven years ago.

Mr. RUBIN. Now, how many children have you?

Mrs. WICKKOWICZ. Two, and two dead.

Mr. RUBIN. Did any policeman or constable hit you?

The INTERPRETER. She says she went down to the store on the 21st, and on the street she had her babies on her arm. She says the State police come up on a horse and walked over her and the baby rolled off her arms, and then finally she rolled over and got up and picked up the baby and looked up to see what happened, and she saw this State trooper hit one of the men over the head.

The CHAIRMAN. Did any policeman hit her?

The INTERPRETER. No; just the horse. The policeman did not touch her; just the horse; walked over her hand.

Senator McKELLAR. Did the horse step on her hand?

The INTERPRETER. Yes; the horse stepped on her hand, she says.

Senator McKELLAR. Did she have a doctor?

The INTERPRETER. No; she did not have any doctor, she says; she just lay in bed and had no doctor.

Senator McKELLAR. Was her hand hurt also?

The INTERPRETER. She says that she had her arms up in a sling for a week. It hurt her so bad that she had, she says—that her arm was so sore it hurt awful.

Senator STERLING. Was there a big crowd there at the meeting then?

The INTERPRETER. She says there was a big crowd.

Senator STERLING. Were you in the crowd?

The INTERPRETER. No; she was on the outside of the street—of the people along the street there. She was not right in the crowd, but along the road some place.

Senator STERLING. Were the policemen or constables trying to disperse the crowd?

The INTERPRETER. She says that, yes, she says that they were trying to get the crowd away.

Senator WALSH. How many rooms have you in your house?

The INTERPRETER. She says she has four.

Senator WALSH. What rent do you pay?

The INTERPRETER. She has her own place.

## TESTIMONY OF LURGI SIDELLA.

Was called as a witness, and having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. You were at this meeting where we had the testimony from Mr. Brogan, were you?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And, Mr. Sidella, did he tell it about as you saw it? What happened?

Mr. SIDELLA. On March 21 I was taking a walk up—

Mr. RUBIN. September 21 you mean?

Mr. SIDELLA. September 21. I walked up to Clairton, and I saw a big bunch up there; they have a meeting about over 3,000 men. And I sat down, and after a while I see, after 10 or 15 minutes, about seven of those State troops, personally, with a horse, come with double time in there, and the first one they had, they walked right through a stand they had there, they had there a flag right beside the man, he was speaking, and the first thing he done he got hold of the club and he knocked the flag down. The horse he walked a little bit and come over on top of the flag.

Mr. RUBIN. Do you mean that the horse trampled the flag?

Mr. SIDELLA. The horse he come over the flag; I was standing up there, and one of these men said, "You get out of here, too." The horse he was there and I could not get out of here. He said, "You get out of here," and he start to strike at me. Listen, then he did that, and I should have this Liberty button on, and I had just taken my last month, and I had that in my hand, and I said, "Don't touch me. If you want to fight go over there for 16 months, the way I did, volunteer for 28 months, and don't come around with these women and children and these poor people around here." I said, "Don't knock no flag down." He said, "We never knock any flag down." I said, "Yes; you did; you never done that, but the man who come with you, he knocked the flag down."

Senator McKELLAR. What man was it that did that?

Mr. SIDELLA. He was a private.

Senator STERLING. He was not a constable that knocked the flag down?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes; he was a policeman, a State troops, a policeman.

Senator WALSH. He was a private?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir; was one of the squad.

Senator STERLING. Was he dressed in the uniform of a State police?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes; he had the uniform on. I said, "You ought to be ashamed of what you done to-day."

Senator STERLING. Do you think that he struck at the flag deliberately for the purpose of knocking down the flag, or did the flag get knocked down, he striking at it accidentally?

Mr. SIDELLA. I could not say that. I know I say here he went and strike the flag down, he went and struck the flag down and grabbed Mr. Brogan. And he says, "Watch, I am going to get that flag." and Mr. Brogan grabbed the flag off of the ground and he had it in his hand.

Mr. RUBIN. Then what happened?

Mr. SIDELLA. As soon as the talk about it was this corporal, I says, "You ought to be ashamed of what you done to-day."

Senator STERLING. But you would hardly say that he deliberately knocked the flag down—intended to knock the flag down.

Mr. SIDELLA. I could not say. He knocked the flag down with a club.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever work in any of these mills before you went into the Army?

Mr. RUBIN. Have you finished about that?

Mr. SIDELLA. No. Well, he wanted to chase me out of this place, and I said, "You could not chase me out of here at all." He said, "Why not?" I said, "This is my property around here." He says, "This is your property; go inside." What is the sense of him asking me, to chase me out of the property, and I can stay inside and outside of my property, I told him. He never bothered me any more.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you work in these mills before you went into the Army, Mr. Sidella?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you work there?

Mr. SIDELLA. From 1912.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you worked in the mills since you came back from the Army?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been discharged from the Army?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you work in them after you came back from the Army?

Mr. SIDELLA. After I came back from the Army I worked a month and a half

The CHAIRMAN. Then, did you go out on a strike?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes; I see everybody else go out; I go out.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the union?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes; I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you at the time you went out?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you go out? What complaint did you have?

Mr. SIDELLA. I go out; I see all the rest of the people go out, and I go out, too. I see all of the rest of the people go out, and I go out, too.

The CHAIRMAN. You just got out because the others went out?

Mr. SIDELLA. I know what the trouble is. I go out.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know what the trouble was?

Mr. SIDELLA. Well, the trouble, why, a fellow came to me and he asked me, "Have you any union card?" I said, "No." He said, "Why don't you get one? If you don't you will get in wrong." I say, "I am going to get my union card myself." I go out myself when I see them go out.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have it at that time?

Mr. SIDELLA. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. After you went out you got it?

Mr. SIDELLA. After I went out I got it.

The CHAIRMAN. And the only reason for your going out was because the others went out?

Mr. SIDELLA. For the reason that the others went out.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the others had not gone out you would have stayed?

Mr. SIDELLA. If the others had not gone out I would have stayed.

Senator STERLING. What wages were you getting?

Mr. SIDELLA. I was getting 50 cents an hour.

Senator STERLING. How many hours did you work?

Mr. SIDELLA. I worked 12 hours a day and I was paid for 14.

Senator STERLING. And that gave you how much?

Mr. SIDELLA. That gave me \$7 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a married man?

Mr. SIDELLA. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your nationality?

Mr. SIDELLA. I am an Italian; at the present time I am an American.

The CHAIRMAN. When were you naturalized?

Mr. SIDELLA. About two months ago.

The CHAIRMAN. And you were in the United States Army, were you?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir; in the old Eighteenth Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you were naturalized?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You had taken out your first papers?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir; I took out my first papers five years ago.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you satisfied with the conditions in the shop?

Mr. SIDELLA. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Why not?

Mr. SIDELLA. No; because I not satisfied because when I left the United States everything was all right. I was paid 33 cents an hour, and at the time I got back home I worked 14 hours, 12 hours a day and got pay for 14 hours, or \$7 a day. When I got back the United States gave me \$125. As soon as I go back home I went in the store to buy a suit and it cost \$65, and a pair of shoes cost \$15. Now, they give me the \$7 a day. I ain't got no money. Who is going to support my people back home?

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you mean?

Mr. SIDELLA. Back in Italy. I have got my mother and father back there.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been sending them money?

Mr. SIDELLA. No, sir; I have got my father and mother back there. This is my home to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. You can not send them anything; can not send anything to them out of your work?

Mr. SIDELLA. I do work every day.

Senator McKELLAR. Before you went to the war, did you send them anything?

Mr. SIDELLA. Before I went to the war I did not send them a cent.

The CHAIRMAN. And you never have sent them anything?

Mr. SIDELLA. I don't have to send anything.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said you had them to support?

Mr. SIDELLA. Some; I want to support him, you know.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have not been able to do anything for their support?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Up to this time?

Mr. SIDELLA. Up to this time.

Senator PHIPPS. You are a single man?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And you have no house of your own?

Mr. SIDELLA. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Where do you board? Do you board?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, I board.

Senator PHIPPS. What do you pay a week for your board?

Mr. SIDELLA. I pay \$45 a month.

Senator PHIPPS. You pay \$45 a month for your board?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And room?

Mr. SIDELLA. One room.

Senator PHIPPS. One room and board?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. On that basis, you are earning \$7 a day, counting out for Sundays, or five days' work in a month, you make about \$200 a month, or \$180 a month you would earn, and out of that it costs you \$45 a month for your board?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean to say that you can not save anything out of the difference of \$135 after paying for your clothes?

Mr. SIDELLA. No, sir; I do not.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, it costs you more for clothes than it does me?

Mr. SIDELLA. I think so. I think so. I think it costs me more than you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your age?

Mr. SIDELLA. Twenty-four.

Senator MCKELLAR. Were all these other young men with you at the time of this flag incident?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes; only one. This man here was with me; right with me.

Senator MCKELLAR. None of the rest of them were with you?

Mr. SIDELLA. They were some place else; we two were together.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us swear all of them. Do you boys here, if you are sworn, do you agree with the witness who has just testified?

VOICES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you all American citizens?

VOICES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All of you have your papers out complete?

VOICES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of you born in this country?

A VOICE. I was.

The CHAIRMAN. No more than one?

(No response.)

Senator PHIPPS. Have you been allowed to go into any of the union meetings, Mr. Sidella?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any union meeting since that date?

Mr. SIDELLA. Not in Clairton, there were not any.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you all volunteers in the war?

Mr. SIDELLA. I am the only one that volunteered in the war. I was in the old Eighteenth Pennsylvania National Guard. I got transferred from the National Guard, and I went to the One hundred and eleventh, C company.

The CHAIRMAN. Any of you boys across the sea?

Mr. SIDELLA. All of them.

Senator PHIPPS. How many of you work in the mills? Do all of you work in the mills?

VOICES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are all of you out on a strike?

VOICES. Yes, sir.

A VOICE. I worked 14 hours, when I worked night, and I got to bed at 3.30, and I eat my supper at 4 o'clock. If I can do something else for one hour and then home at 4.30, I have got to get up at 5 o'clock.

Senator McKELLAR. What was your work?

Mr. SIDELLA. Heater helper.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you get a day?

Mr. SIDELLA. Sometimes I get \$4, sometimes I get \$8, and sometimes \$10.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you get as a soldier, do you remember?

Mr. SIDELLA. A soldier? A dollar a day.

The CHAIRMAN. A dollar a day?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir; and I bought Liberty bonds and—

Mr. RUBIN. You were fighting for your country then?

Mr. SIDELLA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not fighting for the pay?

Mr. SIDELLA. No; not for the pay.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you happen to go out when you had no grievances?

Mr. RUBIN. He said that he did not want to work 15 hours a day.

Senator McKELLAR. What do the others say?

The CHAIRMAN. Did the rest of you boys have any complaint about the hours of work and about the pay?

A VOICE. We was not satisfied.

### TESTIMONY OF ANDREW PASTOR.

(Andrew Pastor, having been produced as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your nationality; what is the nationality of your father and mother?

Mr. PASTOR. My father is Irish and my mother is German.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your employment in the mill?

Mr. PASTOR. Why, I am a laborer.

Senator PHIPPS. And how many hours a day do you work?

Mr. PASTOR. Nine and a half hours a day and 11½ hours at night. I work 9½ hours during the day and 11½ hours at night.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the rate of pay?

Mr. PASTOR. Forty-two cents an hour.

Senator PHIPPS. And do you get paid extra time for overtime?

Mr. PASTOR. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And you work 11½ hours and you are paid straight 42 cents an hour, is that it?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Without any overpay?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And there is no time and a half included?

Mr. PASTOR. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You say that you are a laborer. In which department?

Mr. PASTOR. The Morris & Daily plant.

Senator PHIPPS. Does that plant belong to the Steel Corporation or is it an independent plant?

Mr. PASTOR. It is an independent plant.

Senator PHIPPS. Have all of the employees of Morris & Daily gone out on a strike?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir; everyone of them.

Senator PHIPPS. About how many are there there?

Mr. PASTOR. About 500.

Senator PHIPPS. About 500 altogether?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Is the plant shut down now or is it working?

Mr. PASTOR. It was shut down for about a week. There are about 15 working, I guess—trying to work.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any idea how many are working there now?

Mr. PASTOR. The latest report that I had from the fellows that went back there that there were only 15, and no rollers or anything.

Senator WALSH. Raise your voice; I can not hear you.

Mr. PASTOR. That is the shipping department; but all of the other workers are still away.

Senator WALSH. Do you belong to the union?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. How many of your fellow employees of those 500 belong to the union?

Mr. PASTOR. They all belong to it.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you take a vote on the strike, to determine whether or not you would go out?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How did you cast your ballot? I do not mean that in that way, but what was the method followed? Were you handed a ballot and did you turn it right in after you marked it, to somebody?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Who was responsible for counting the ballots, if you know?

Mr. PASTOR. I do not know who was responsible for that.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not know how the vote went on the strike, do you, in the Morris & Daily plant?

Mr. PASTOR. They all voted to go out on the strike.



Senator PHIPPS. They all voted to go on the strike?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Who organized you there?

Mr. PASTOR. The American Federation of Labor.

Senator McKELLAR. I know; but who was the representative?

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Brogan was the representative there.

Senator WALSH. You said something about meetings being stopped. What do you know about the union to which you belong not having any opportunity to hold meetings?

Mr. PASTOR. I do not know what the reason was. They would not let them have meetings in Clairton.

Senator WALSH. Have you had any meetings in Clairton since that strike incident that you spoke of?

Mr. PASTOR. No; I never had none since.

Senator WALSH. You have not had any since?

Mr. RUBIN. You had one since, didn't you?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes; we had one at No. 7—district No. 7.

Mr. RUBIN. Is that a school district?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. That is what Mr. Brogan spoke about?

Mr. PASTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And you have not had any meeting since?

Mr. PASTOR. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you tried to have any meetings since?

Mr. PASTOR. No; we have not tried to have any meetings since, because we did not get any permits to do so.

#### TESTIMONY OF W. N. McNAIR.

(W. N. McNair was called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. McNair, you are an attorney at law?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And you have just returned from the service?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you been employed to represent or to look after some men who were arrested in any part of this city?

Mr. McNAIR. I have been handling the work on the south side—at the south side police station.

Senator WALSH. Handling what work?

Mr. McNAIR. The defending of the men arrested there.

Senator McKELLAR. The members of the union?

Mr. RUBIN. That is, here in the city.

Mr. McNAIR. That is, here in the city of Pittsburgh. The attorneys seem to have difficulty in all of the local police courts. I might illustrate that by this morning's experience. At the south side I was informed that about 50 of the men had been arrested last night. I went down half an hour before the hearing in order to talk to the men. I asked the desk sergeant if I could see the men, and he refused to allow me to see them. I appealed to the lieutenant, and he refused, so that I could not consult with these men before the hearing.

Senator STERLING. Where were these men?

Mr. McNAIR. They were in jail at the police station.

Senator WALSH. And did you tell them that you were their attorney?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes; yes. I had been there before. The attorney before me had been expelled from the court and refused—they had refused him permission to defend a man, and I was taking his place, and I had been there for a couple of days, and he knew that I represented the workers. The men who were on strike—I can not give the names, because there were a large number of them, and I represented those who were on strike generally. If the man is on strike, he will get a fine or a jail sentence, but a man who is at work, the magistrate, Mr. Lloyd, he would say to him, "Get out of here."

Mr. RUBIN. Even if they were charged with the same offense?

Mr. McNAIR. Surely; yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. If he was charged with the same offense that the men charged with who were on strike, he would fine the men who were on strike and the men who were not on strike he would get a discharge?

Mr. McNAIR. That is my experience.

Senator STERLING. Well, what was the defense put up by the men?

Mr. McNAIR. I can hardly say that there was any defense. Sometimes they would say that they were suspicious persons and other times they would say that they were in for disorderly conduct or something of that sort.

Senator WALSH. Is not their written complaint filed under your system?

Mr. McNAIR. There is not before the police magistrate; no.

Senator WALSH. Is it possible to arrest a man in any court without a written paper charging him with a specific offense which he can see, so that you can see what he is charged with?

Mr. McNAIR. I would like to have you go with me to the south side station to-morrow morning and you would see the men brought in there and the arresting officer with the complaints against these men, and Mr. Lloyd will say, "Are you a citizen?" Then he will say, "Are you working?" If he answers no, he will say, "Ten days or \$10," and he goes out.

Senator WALSH. Is not there any plea taken?

Mr. McNAIR. No.

Senator WALSH. Is not there a complaint read to him—to the one who is brought in?

Mr. McNAIR. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Has not he a right to demand and to examine the complaint?

Mr. McNAIR. Well, we have a good many rights. I think that I have a right to appear for the men, but this morning Mr. Lloyd said to me, "Who do you represent?" I said, "You know that I represent the Federation of Labor." Then Mr. Lloyd said, "I do not think he ought to be here unless these men ask for him." "Well," I said, "do you want to put me out like you did the other fellow. If you do, all right; I will go. I do not want to have any trouble," but he insisted that I ought to know the names of the men whom I was representing, and I said, "I asked to see the men before the hearing and you would not allow me to go to see the workers."

Finally they permitted me to stay there. The cases are called hurriedly, and there is no opportunity for cross-examination of the presiding officers; they are the policemen and the deputies employed, and they are fined if they are strikers, but if they are working they tell them to get out.

Senator STERLING. Had you been informed by any of these men that they wanted to see you as an attorney?

Mr. McNAIR. I was called up last night and I was told that some of the men were arrested, and they asked me to go down to the hearing. I was the attorney.

Senator STERLING. Did you explain to the judge how you had been retained?

Mr. McNAIR. I was retained by Mr. Rubin, and I was assigned to the South Side station, and, of course, some of the women would come up and tell me their husbands were there. In one case this morning a woman came up and desired to have her testimony taken to the effect that her husband had been home at night, and they refused to hear her.

Senator WALSH. And don't you know that you had a right to demand a copy of the written complaint from them?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes; but I was over there on sufferance by Mr. Lloyd, the magistrate, and if I had said much more I would have been put out.

Senator WALSH. Why did not you, as attorney at law, careful of the rights of your clients, demand a copy of the complaint?

Mr. McNAIR. I would not have done any good. It would not have done any good at all.

Senator McKELLAR. They could not take that right away from you.

Mr. McNAIR. They would have thrown me out.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you testify that you are a member of the bar and admitted to practice?

Mr. McNAIR. I have been admitted to practice for 15 years, and they know me over there. They know who I am. The magistrate they had prior to this was somewhat more courteous; he was a different magistrate, and they changed magistrates, and they brought Mr. Lloyd there, and he sits there with his head down and mumbles with the policemen so that I can not hear him unless I get up close to him. Generally it goes about like this: He says, "Are you working?" "No." "Ten days or \$10," and away they go back to jail.

Senator WALSH. Is the magistrate a lawyer?

Mr. McNAIR. No; they do not have attorneys as magistrates.

Senator WALSH. He is a layman, appointed by the mayor?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes; a politician.

Senator WALSH. I am anxious to have all Americans respect our institutions, and I want to distinguish in this case between the politician and the company and the individual and the public official and the individual. You, of course, do not claim for a moment that the company has any influence over these men, but that it is their own bias and prejudice?

Mr. McNAIR. Well, the company has a large number of deputies, and they stand around to one side of the magistrate and they run things pretty much over there. I do not know whether they are

deputy sheriffs or what they are, but whatever they are, they go around the neighborhood and they say, find a man that is striking, some complaints they made is that he was simply walking along the street. There were two men there this morning who were up at 5.30 o'clock and they were simply walking along the street. They did not say that they were accosting the workmen, and I did not see any charge, but they simply told the magistrate that they were suspicious persons and they were fined.

Senator WALSH. How much were they fined?

Mr. McNAIR. Twenty-five dollars or 30 days. Some of them came with just their undershirts, and they would take them in there—wake them up at home.

Senator WALSH. Can these men be released on bail?

Mr. McNAIR. It is impossible, for this reason: These men are all there—there were some 30 cases on trial. To get those transcripts out and to get the petitions filed, it would take a dozen lawyers.

Senator MCKELLAR. I thought there was not any charge. How can you get a transcript if there is no charge?

Mr. McNAIR. They write up the proceedings after the case is all heard, and then you can get a transcript.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you say there were 30 being heard there this morning?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Is not 30 quite a number to be brought into the police court all at one time, at one day?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Were they all there because they were engaged in some particular disturbance?

Mr. McNAIR. I can only give you my recollection of what the arrests were. I can illustrate. Here are two men brought in. They were walking between Eleventh and Twelfth Streets early this morning, and the deputy said that he asked them what they were doing and they did not give him a satisfactory answer, and he brought them in as suspicious persons.

Senator STERLING. Were these men given an opportunity to testify?

Mr. McNAIR. With most of them it was simply, "Are you a citizen? Are you working, and have you got anything to say." In a minute it is "\$10 or 10 days."

Senator STERLING. They were asked if they had anything to say, were they?

Mr. McNAIR. Sometimes they were.

Senator STERLING. Did they testify in their own behalf?

Mr. McNAIR. In some cases they did. There was one crowd of men that were brought in. It was said they were up on the outer end of the ward, and had stopped men that were going to work. They all said that they had never seen a man and that they knew nothing about it, and had nothing to do with it, but they were all fined just the same.

Senator WALSH. Is there a fine imposed in each and every case now?

Mr. McNAIR. All except those men that were working, and those men that were working, they were told to get out.

Mr. RUBIN. Explain the method of taking bail and the cost of the bail and the time necessary.

Mr. McNAIR. That is the ordinary procedure—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). Is not there a chance for the defendant to say, when the sentence is imposed, he will take an appeal?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Were you permitted to ask questions—to bring out their defense?

Mr. McNAIR. Well, sometimes I was, but generally the attitude of the policemen and the magistrate and the deputies was such that if I would try I would not be there very long, and the lawyer who was there before me he was made to get out of the court room because he cross-examined the lieutenant.

Mr. RUBIN. Are you permitted—are you given an opportunity to ask of the magistrate, or to state to the magistrate, the points you think should be said in favor of the defendant, or why sentence should be passed or why he should be given a second chance?

Mr. McNAIR. I would not be there very long if I said very much.

Senator WALSH. You said that this judge was transferred from another place.

Mr. McNAIR. Yes; he was transferred from the north side.

Mr. RUBIN. Who did that?

Mr. McNAIR. I do not know, but I think the local judge there was not quite as severe as this Magistrate Lloyd proved to be.

Mr. RUBIN. Well, tell about the other incident.

Mr. McNAIR. Well, there was one incident there. I will give that in order to show the activities of these local deputies out Woodlawn way. There were two Italians who are here to-day, and I can call them here if you want to examine them. They came to me to take an appeal where they had been fined in Woodlawn. There they had the same procedure as here. These deputies are stopping everybody in the street the same as they did here. These men got off the train and immediately they were accosted by the local policeman from the Jones & Laughlin mill. They said to him, "Where are you going?" They were residents of Clairton. They answered, "We are going to see our cousin," who is an American citizen, naturalized. They said, "Where are you from?" "Clairton." They said, "You won't." Then they took them down to the local jail there of the plant, and they beat them up, and they held them most all day; and they took them before the local squire and he fined them and they wanted to take an appeal.

Senator WALSH. You are an attorney?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes, sir; I am an attorney.

Senator WALSH. Have you sued the company?

Mr. McNAIR. No; we have not completed the appeal. They said that they would not pay the fine that was assessed upon them before this esquire, and I could not find out which one he was, but finally I called them up in turn, and finally I found out who had the case; and they would not pay the fine. When they found out that they would not pay the fine, they were taken by the local deputies and taken to the jail, and they were held there, held there until 10 o'clock, and then they were taken to the train, and at the point of the revolver they were put on the train, and they were told that if they came back "this is what you get."

They did not want to take the transcript. I took them with me out there, and as soon as we stepped off the train the local police

lined up, but fortunately they knew who I was, and we were not molested, and we got out of the town by an automobile. When you get off the train, these local deputies will stand there and look everybody over, and if there are men whom they think might be interested in any way in the strike, they arrest them as they did these two men.

Senator PHIPPS. You told us about 30 cases—that there were 30 cases in this court here this morning?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. About how many of those cases were fined or given sentences and how many released?

Mr. McNAIR. Well, there were three men who said they were working, and they were told to get out. No testimony was taken practically on any of those cases, but they simply said to them, "Are you working?" And they said, "Yes," and they were told to get out. As near as I can recollect, all of the rest of them went back to jail and had to be fined.

Senator PHIPPS. And what became of the other 20?

Mr. McNAIR. They were still held there, being held for further hearing.

Senator WALSH. You say that you have reason to believe that there are 20 men who have been heard this morning, and who are held there for a further hearing?

Mr. McNAIR. Who have been heard—

Senator WALSH. Who should have been heard this morning?

Mr. McNAIR. I do not know just when they should have been heard.

Senator PHIPPS. You said that there were 20 there in jail?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes; I was informed about that number.

Mr. RUBIN. There have been more than 500 arrests. Some of them have been held—they have held court at 7 o'clock in the morning and at 8 o'clock at night, and they have been taken out of their homes at 3 o'clock without any charges against them.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that a statement that you want the stenographer to take down?

Mr. RUBIN. It is my statement.

Senator WALSH. As an attorney of 15 years' standing at the bar and as an American citizen and as a man who respects the administration of justice, I want to ask if you honestly believe that there is discrimination in the court in which you have been trying cases, in the cases of men who are on strike, discriminated against, as distinct from other citizens?

Mr. McNAIR. Yes; I firmly believe that most of these men are brought in there and their only crime is that they are not at work, because they are all asked whether they are at work or not. For instance, one man had some trouble this morning with a deputy, one of the J. & L. fellows, one of the J. & L. police, and he pulled a gun on him—

Senator PHIPPS. Who pulled the gun?

Mr. McNAIR. The man who was arrested. And he was asked whether he was working or not, and he said he was and there was no fine.

Senator STERLING. Was there any more testimony taken in that case?

Mr. McNAIR. No. When he said that he as working—at least there was no testimony taken then. I don't know what will eventually be done.

Senator STERLING. Was anything said about why he pulled the gun on him?

Mr. McNAIR. Well, he got into an altercation with one of the J. & L. deputies, as I remember.

Senator STERLING. What do you mean by "J. & L. deputies"?

Mr. McNAIR. The Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.'s deputies. He testified against the man before the magistrate and he produced the gun.

### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM J. BURKE.

(William J. Burke was called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman, I understand that you have some little statement to make?

Mr. BURKE. Yes; I have requested to be allowed to make a little statement and try to correct a wrong impression that has gone broadcast, that I do not believe is to the best interests of the country, and that is that the organized labor claims that an employer can not discharge a bad man nor can he hire a good one. It is just the reverse. I am 35 years a member of organized labor, 25 years on a committee, and now I am chairman of the conductors' committee for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and during all those years we have never at any time taken the position and attempted to defend a bad man. Our trouble has been where some bad official probably wanted to get rid of a good man that cost a lot of money to train him, but then we have never gotten into very great difficulties. That is all I desire to say. I believe that some people are of a different opinion, and what I mean is they think that organized labor means that you can not discharge a bad man.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Burke, how do you define an open shop?

Mr. BURKE. I do not know much about it. An open shop? I do not know much about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you have an idea of what an open shop is?

Mr. BURKE. My idea of organized labor is simply to organize for the benefit—for better wages and for better working conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. And does that always mean a closed shop?

Mr. BURKE. That does not mean a closed shop. We have scores of men on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad that do not belong to any union, still they are enjoying all the blessings that accrues from organized labor, and that is true—

The CHAIRMAN. Does organized labor discriminate against them?

Mr. BURKE. No, sir; and organized labor does not mean that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you represent this district in Congress?

Mr. BURKE. Yes; I represent the whole State of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. You are one of the Congressmen at large.

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. You are the first chairman of what committee, did you say?

Mr. BURKE. I was first chairman of the general committee for the conductors of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.

Senator WALSH. As chairman of that committee, do you deal with the officials of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And do you deal with them from time to time in regard to wage scales and the working conditions?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And you have been doing that for 25 years?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Have you ever made a request for your union of those officials for what is referred to here as the closed shop?

Mr. BURKE. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Namely, a shop employing only union men?

Mr. BURKE. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. As a matter of fact, are there many nonunion men employed on the Baltimore & Ohio whom you indirectly help, speak for, when you go over this schedule?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir; many of them.

Senator WALSH. And no suggestion has ever been made that they should hire only nonunion men?

Mr. BURKE. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. During all those years?

Mr. BURKE. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Do you know of anything in the labor circles or of any instances of the closed shop? Do you know of any labor union officials insisting that anybody shall employ only those who have union cards?

Mr. BURKE. I have no knowledge of it.

Senator WALSH. How often do you make up those schedules, every few years?

Mr. BURKE. Oh, no; they run as high as five and six years.

Mr. RUBIN. And you are officially recognized as the representative of the union?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. But the contract or the agreement affects everybody?

Mr. BURKE. The agreement or contract affects everybody; yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And during these 25 years your consultations and agreements have helped the nonunion men as well as the union men?

Mr. BURKE. Sure. I have to go outside, against my own union, when a question of seniority was involved, and decide against my own brothers and in the interest of nonunion men.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know anything about this strike?

Mr. BURKE. Nothing except what I have read.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there anything else that you would like to state?

Mr. BURKE. No, sir. I would just like to make one more statement. In 1887, in the city of Pittsburgh, the men on the Pennsylvania Railroad, I think 1,600 members West voted for a strike and a thousand east. It was submitted to a board, which I happened to be a member of, and on account of the contract held by the men on the Baltimore & Ohio and the Lake Erie, and other adjacent roads it was deferred, the strike was deferred for 30 days; and then at the



end of 30 days a settlement had been reached. Now, several years ago, on the Monongahela Division of the Pennsylvania Railroad, the men without authority from the organization struck, and they were ordered to go back.

## AFTER RECESS.

The committee met at 2 p. m. of the same day, pursuant to recess.

## TESTIMONY OF MR. H. F. LILEY.

Mr. H. F. LILEY was called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been working in any of the steel mills?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an employer?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir; I am a man that has been in charge of the situation at Butler, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by being in charge of the situation?

Mr. LILEY. In charge of the organization, and I have been in charge since the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you one of the organizers?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How are these organizers paid?

Mr. LILEY. They are paid by the international organization.

The CHAIRMAN. So much per day?

Mr. LILEY. So much per month.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you receive per month?

Mr. LILEY. \$200 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they paid anything according to the number of the members who join, so much per member?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead in your own way and give us the facts of the situation.

Mr. LILEY. I have been in charge of the Butler situation since the inauguration of the campaign about last Thanksgiving Day.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many men are employed in that mill?

Mr. LILEY. About 4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You started in a campaign about last Thanksgiving?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir; about that time.

Mr. RUBIN. I want to direct him to one point. Were you arrested some time ago?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. When and by whom?

Mr. LILEY. On the 26th day of September by a couple who claimed to be officers by the name of Brink and Stephens, at West Winfield, Pa.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you discharged?

Mr. LILEY. I was discharged.

Mr. RUBIN. On habeas corpus?

Mr. LILEY. On habeas corpus proceedings.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you have any money in your possession at the time that you were arrested?

Mr. LILEY. I had a portfolio with me that had a number of official papers in it and that had a roll of money.

Mr. RUBIN. How much?

Mr. LILEY. \$87.

Mr. RUBIN. Was that money returned to you?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Who took the money away from you?

Mr. LILEY. The arresting officers, having the portfolio containing the money and the papers and so on.

Mr. RUBIN. After your discharge on habeas corpus by the Common Pleas Court, did you cause the arrest of the officer who took the money from you?

Mr. LILEY. I caused that arrest of both officers.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you testify as to the fact of the money being taken from you?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you have any witness to corroborate you?

Mr. LILEY. Yes; I had one witness that saw me put the money in the portfolio.

Mr. RUBIN. Was there any witness to contradict your testimony?

Mr. LILEY. None whatever.

Mr. RUBIN. What did the justice do to the police officers?

Mr. LILEY. He turned them loose; he discharged them.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they know that you were an organizer?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How did they know that?

Mr. LILEY. I could not say how they knew that I was an organizer. Well, in fact, to make it plain, when they arrested me they stated that they would arrest me as a suspicious character. They had a warrant for three other men.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had not been an organizer, would you have been arrested just the same?

Mr. LILEY. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not done because you were an organizer?

Mr. LILEY. I think so. ~~One~~ because we were endeavoring to hold a meeting of the men at this particular place, was the reason given me.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were the policemen?

Mr. LILEY. Officers Brink and Stephens, or they claimed to be officers.

Mr. RUBIN. Are you allowed to hold any meetings in the city of Butler?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir; we have never had any of our meetings molested around the city of Butler since the campaign or the strike has been on.

Senator WALSH. What charge did they make against you, being a suspicious character, when you were arraigned?

Mr. LILEY. There was proven to be absolutely no charge.

Senator WALSH. Don't they tell people down here whether they are charged with drunkenness or larceny or robbery or anything else?

Mr. LILEY. The officers at the time of the arrest—

Senator WALSH (interposing). Don't they tell anything—

Mr. RUBIN. I was able to get a discharge on a writ of habeas corpus because the commitment failed to enumerate any charge—he and two others were held—because the commitment failed to enumerate any charge, and I was able to get his release on habeas corpus.

Senator WALSH. How long were you held?

Mr. LILEY. From about 9 o'clock in the evening until 10.30 o'clock the next morning.

Senator WALSH. And you were not brought before a magistrate the next morning?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. And no complaint was ever filed against you?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Was your commitment to the jail on a judgment rendered by the justice or made on arrest?

Mr. LILEY. It was a commitment made on the arrest. The justice never even asked us if we wanted a hearing, or what the charge was, or anything else.

Senator STERLING. And you were not given notice as to when to appear before the justice?

Mr. LILEY. Later on, after he gave instructions to return us to the county jail and we were to appear the next morning—the next day at 2 o'clock for hearing.

Senator WALSH. Was there an opportunity given you to get bail? Did you ask for it?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Did you ask for it?

Mr. LILEY. I asked for it; I did. I asked the justice if there would be a chance for us to give bail, and he hemmed and hawed around a bit, and he said, "You can attend to that better at Butler." This was about some 15 miles out of Butler. They turned us over to the custody of the county jail, and would not give us an opportunity to go to the telephone and to call our attorneys.

Senator STERLING. And the two gentlemen who were with you, were they gotten out on habeas corpus at the same time?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Before whom was the habeas corpus?

Mr. LILEY. Judge Rider.

Mr. RUBIN. That is a court of record, a court of common pleas, the judge of the Court of Common Pleas.

Senator STERLING. How long were you in having your hearing before the judge of the Court of Common Pleas?

Mr. LILEY. How long was our hearing?

Senator STERLING. How long was it before you had your hearing before the Court of Common Pleas?

Mr. LILEY. This happened on Friday evening and the habeas corpus papers were filed on Saturday and our hearing was the following Tuesday.

Senator STERLING. And these men who arrested you, were they policemen of the town of Butler?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Who were they?

Senator WALSH. What were they, deputy sheriffs?

Mr. LILEY. I do not know. We asked them, and they would not tell us whether they were officers or who.

Senator WALSH. Have you found out since?

Mr. LILEY. I have no definite information.

The CHAIRMAN. How does this connect up with this strike in any way, in your mind, or with the steel company?

Mr. LILEY. Oh, this is at a place where they have mines operated by the steel company.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the police officers connected with the steel company in any way?

Mr. LILEY. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Your testimony is that you were arrested by a couple of policemen and that \$85 was taken from your book?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir; and here is what they stated, and what the papers stated, that we were down there inciting a riot, and that that is why we had been picked up.

Mr. RUBIN. And the two other men who were arrested with you—they were organizers also?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You do not know who is responsible for the statements in the papers?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. What was the date of the arrest?

Mr. LILEY. The 26th of September.

Senator WALSH. And what was the date of the strike?

Mr. LILEY. That had taken place the 6th of August in Butler.

Senator WALSH. And that was going on at that time?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir. But this place where I was arrested was 15 miles away from Butler and there was no strike there.

Senator WALSH. Were there any organized shops there?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. And you were trying to organize a union?

Mr. LILEY. I was soliciting the employees to organize them.

Senator WALSH. And while you were trying to organize them you were arrested?

Mr. LILEY. We had not held a meeting there.

Senator WALSH. How long had you been in town?

Mr. LILEY. Possibly 30 minutes.

Senator STERLING. Did these men wear any uniforms?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did they disclose any badges at any time?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you let any man arrest you and take away your money?

Mr. LILEY. Well, we asked him who he spoke for, and he said that he spoke for the superintendent of the plants here, and he hesitated a moment—

The CHAIRMAN. So he was a police officer?

Mr. LILEY. He said that he was an officer.

The CHAIRMAN. And he had no star or badge on? Neither one of them?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir; none whatever.

Mr. RUBIN. But the magistrate recognized them as officers?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The magistrate did?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Is this plant that is located in this town a plant of the United States Steel Corporation or is it one of the independent companies?

Mr. LILEY. It is, as I am informed and believe—which plant do you mean?

Senator WALSH. In the town where you were trying to organize the union?

Mr. LILEY. In West Winfield?

Senator WALSH. Yes; when you went for the purpose of organizing a union?

Mr. LILEY. This, as I am informed, is operated under the Carnegie Steel Co.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the name of the plant?

Mr. LILEY. The Pittsburgh Limestone Co.

Senator WALSH. Who were the other two who were arrested?

Mr. LILEY. Joseph B. Cannon and—

Senator WALSH. What is his residence?

Mr. LILEY. I think New York City is his residence, and Alexander Ironsides. I do not know what his residence is.

Senator STERLING. Did you state your residence?

Mr. LILEY. My residence is Kansas City, Mo., my permanent residence.

Senator STERLING. You have not been working in any of the plants yourself?

Mr. LILEY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. You are an organizer?

Mr. LILEY. Yes, sir.

#### TESTIMONY OF C. W. SYPNIEWSKI.

C. W. Sypniewski was thereupon called as a witness, and having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

Mr. RUBIN. You are an attorney at law and admitted to practice in this city?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, for 16 years.

Mr. RUBIN. For 16 years?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you been retained to defend some of the strikers in this city?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir; at No. 7 Police Station, South Side District.

Mr. RUBIN. And how many days did you appear for the strikers there?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Two days.

Mr. RUBIN. During those two days, how many cases did you have?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I had 37 that they permitted me to represent the other parties.

Mr. RUBIN. And how many that you were not permitted to represent?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. About 12.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell the committee just what took place there and how you were treated?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I was retained on Sunday, the 28th, Mr. Rubin had called me, and I talked with him, and on Monday, the 29th of September, I went down to the Seventh Police Station, on the south side, and had a dozen names of people that were arrested, and I made inquiries about what they were charged, and they looked up the docket, and some were charged as suspicious persons and disorderly conduct and others violating the city ordinances.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you get the names?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. From the calendar or docket. The sergeant read them off to me. They had a big call of the calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said you had the names of 12 men.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I had the names of 12 men that I got from the south side headquarters of the union, from one of the men in charge there, of persons that were arrested, and I made the inquiries about these gentlemen and what they were charged with and what they were fined. And I asked for transcripts—those were cases that were tried on Monday morning, and some that were tried on Friday and Saturday before that, and I asked for transcripts, and he took down a memorandum as to these various transcripts, and then he called the desk sergeant, and then the desk sergeant called the commissioner, Walsh, and he says, "I will have to see him before I can get the transcripts." When Commissioner Walsh come down, I says that I was retained by the American Federation of Labor to represent the strikers that were charged with offenses in this station, and I will probably be here every morning to defend them. He said, "Who is paying you?" I said, "I am retained by the American Federation of Labor, and they are paying me."

"Is that so? What do you want?" he says.

I says, "I have 12 names here that I want the transcripts for."

He says, "You can not get them."

"Why can't I?"

"Just because you can't."

I says, "I am entitled to them."

He says, "How are you entitled to them?"

"Well," I says, "under the law if I pay you the 75 cents for the transcript, I am entitled to the transcript. I can demand it of the magistrate. All I want to know is whether I can get these."

"Let me see," he says, "which ones do you want?"

He took a list and prepared them. He said, "You can get this one and this one, but three of these you can not get, because they are more than five days old."

I says, "Why can't I get one that is more than five days old?"

"You can not get it." He said, "Well, we will send them to the law department, and you can clear it up with the law department."

I paid for the number he said I could get, and told him that I would call on the law department and be in the next morning; that would be September 30, to represent some of the persons charged.

I come in the next morning, September 30; the hearing was set for 8 o'clock, and I had with me a court stenographer, Mr. Martin.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell how you came to get the court stenographer.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Well, when I saw the way I was treated on that Monday I talked it over with Mr. Rubin, and Mr. Rubin instructed

me to get a court stenographer so we could have a record of all those proceedings. I says, "I will try it, but I do not think that it will do us any good."

When my cases came, I was representing six cases. I had the names to show it to them.

Senator STERLING. Were those 6 cases—were those part of the 12?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No, those were persons heard before that. These were six cases of arrests on Monday.

Senator STERLING. They were new cases?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. They were new cases entirely, and the hearings were to be had on Tuesday morning at 8 o'clock, and I have some of the transcripts of those.

On the next morning, when my first case was called, there were three men called, and two of them were my clients, whom I was supposed to represent. I got up to the bar inside the railing, and I said to the magistrate "I have a court reporter; would you permit him to sit somewhere around the desk so we can get a record. We would like to get a record this case." The magistrate, whose name is Succop—Bertram P. Succop, he said, "Oh, well," he says, "we have no time to go into these hearings and we do not have any record of proceedings, and we can not take up the time of these hearings in order that you can get a record."

One of the desk sergeants said, "Well, you can put your book down here," he said to Mr. Martin, and the desk is about the length of this desk, and the magistrate was sitting at this end, and he made room for him at the other end of the desk. They started the hearing, and the first case the witnesses appeared to lean over to the magistrate and they started to whisper.

Mr. RUBIN. Who were the witnesses?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Two of them were Jones and Laughlin, officers, and the lieutenant was there and some other officers, and they started whispering, so that I, even, being right across from them, could not hear everything they said. When he got through with the witnesses—the first witness called in that case was Lieut. McAfee. Lieut. McAfee said that he was informed—he already had complaints about these men, and upon these complaints he arrested them. I says, "Were they threatening the people that went to work or threatening their families?" I said, "Officer, what is your name?" I wanted to get a record so that the reporter could hear him, because he would not talk, he would only whisper to the magistrate. He paid no attention to me. I says, "What is your name and where do you live?" There was no answer.

Senator STERLING. Up to that time he had been testifying?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. So that you could not hear him?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I could not and the reporter could not.

Senator STERLING. Had you demanded that he speak louder?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes; I demanded that he speak louder so that the reporter could get it. I asked the magistrate, "Won't you permit me to cross-examine him?"

The magistrate paid no attention, but just called the next witness and examined him. I thought that he would hear all three witnesses and that I could examine them. He finished with the witness, and

I started to question him, and I asked the first officer the same question, and he paid no attention. He started to ask one of the defendants' name. I said, "Magistrate, won't you permit me to cross-examine this man?"

He says, "You have no right here at all. You are only here by courtesy. You can stand here and see what is being done."

I made loud remarks so that the reporter could take it down, Mr. Martin, that I would like to have it noted, Mr. Reporter, that the magistrate does not permit me to cross-examine the witnesses.

Senator STERLING. Just let me ask you: Have you any witnesses here as to what transpired there that morning?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; but I can get Mr. Martin.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you entered your appearance as counsel for this man?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. There is no regular method of entering the appearance, except notifying them that I am the counsel. I had a list of these names, and I told them that I represented these men. That is all the practice we have here in the courts of no record.

Senator WALSH. Proceed.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Well, as I say, when he would not permit me to cross-examine the men, and started to ask one of the men some questions, and the man did not understand him, he asked him, "Were you present at what the officer testified," and the man was a Pole and he could not speak any more of the English language than anything in the world, and I says to the magistrate, "He does not understand you."

"Well," he says, "he ought to."

I says, "Magistrate, if you were over in France, as you were, and you were hauled up to a court of justice in France, and French was fired at you, do you think you would know it?"

He says, "I did."

I says, "I doubt it."

He says, "You are a liar."

When I saw that he answered in that way I said nothing. He says to this fellow, "Just ask what his name is and how long he has been in this country, and ask him if he is a citizen."

The man answered those questions as best he could, and he says, "\$10 or 10 days."

Senator STERLING. What was the man charged with?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. With being a suspicious person.

Mr. RUBIN. That is all?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Were these men citizens?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; none of these four that were before the bar. None were citizens.

Mr. RUBIN. Were there any discharges from that court?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. There were some discharges in the next case called. There were two men in the next batch called, and one man was discharged. He simply said that he got in trouble with the officers and that he was a citizen and he was discharged, and each of my men were fined \$5 or 10 days. The other one was charged with being a suspicious person.

Senator MCKELLAR. The other man had the good fortune not to have a lawyer?



Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes; he had the good fortune not to have a lawyer, and he just had his wife there to speak for him.

The CHAIRMAN. And those who had lawyers, who were discharged?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Some of them were fined, but he was a man who said that he was a citizen, and he had papers, and he was discharged.

Senator WALSH. Is this magistrate a lawyer?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; he is not.

Senator STERLING. How old a man is he?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I would say that he is about 30. Now, this case I speak off—

Mr. RUBIN. Is that man who was discharged working?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; no he was not working. He is working at some other business—a carpenter.

Mr. RUBIN. He was not a striker?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. He was not a striker; no.

Mr. RUBIN. But the strikers were all fined?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes; the strikers were all fined, and he would ask them whether they were striking, and if they said, "Yes," he said, "Why don't you go to work?" and one just said that he did not want to work, and he answered something, and he said "\$10 or 10 days."

Senator STERLING. You have mentioned one case where the man was charged with being a suspicious person. Do you know of any other case where there was another charge, where they were fined?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes; I have here three kinds of charges. In the police station there are three kinds of charges, usually, violation of ordinance, disorderly conduct, and suspicious person, and they have it on the docket "S. P.," meaning suspicious person, and "D. C.," disorderly conduct, and violating the city ordinances "V. O."

Senator STERLING. Violating an ordinance of the city authorizing the arrest of a man on the grounds of being a suspicious person?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes; there is an act of 1869 that permits the arrest and detention and fine of persons under that act.

Senator WALSH. That is a State act?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; it is an ordinance. I have the ordinance here, a copy of it here.

Senator STERLING. I wish you would produce it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it define what it is.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. It simply says that among the various other charges "and suspicious persons, who can give no reasonable account of themselves," so that is the kind of definition.

Mr. RUBIN. And a striker can not give a reasonable account of himself?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Usually he can not.

Mr. RUBIN. To the magistrate?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir. This is a man charged as a suspicious person, "Elia Melnick." Now, these transcripts, I may say, are prepared by the officials themselves, and they are looked over by the law department of the city before they are turned over to me.

Senator STERLING. At the head of which is the city attorney?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And they are gotten after the hearing?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. They are gotten after the hearing.

Senator WALSH. Were you unable to get a copy of a document like that before the hearing?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. There is not any then.

Senator WALSH. Do you mean to tell me that there is no document before the magistrate which you can see before the man is tried?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. There is no document before the magistrate which you can see before the man is tried.

Senator PHIPPS. There is a docket in which his name is entered?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. There is a calendar in which the name is entered or a docket, the date of the arrest, the officer, and the charge, and that is all. After the hearing there is a memorandum that is made up which is called the transcript. These are usually arrest on view, and it is handed—they have a right under the law to arrest a person on view when they see him committing an offense. They should not arrest them if they do not see them, but they do it, and this is the case of Elia Melnik. I went the day before, September 29, 1919, to the station to inquire what he was charged with. They told me "suspicious person." I asked them what bail is needed. They said, "No bail." They won't take any bail. I says, "Will you take a forfeit?" They said, "We will take \$500 in cash," so I got three of these men's friends and they did not have \$500 cash, but they had \$150 cash and \$350 in Liberty bonds. I says, "We have \$350 in Liberty bonds and \$150 cash. Will that suffice?"

He said, "I will have to see the commissioner," he says.

The commissioner said, "All right." We deposited the \$500, and I took it from the men and turned it over to them, so that there is no doubt that they saw that I represented him.

Senator WALSH. Did you get a receipt?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; they did not give a receipt.

Senator WALSH. Did you not get a receipt for the bail money?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. They says, "You have enough witnesses. We have not any time for that." This is one of the men that I represented, and here is the whole transcript: "Arrested by Officer Lieut. McAfee, 1 o'clock p. m., of September 29, 1919; charge, suspicious person." And now, "September 30, 1919, hearing had before B. L. Succop, police magistrate, in and for the city of Pittsburgh. Defendant pleads——." They never asked him anything about what he pleaded.

Lieut. McAfee sworn. Arrested defendant at 1.45 in front of 2520 Carson Street for stopping men on the street. Had much trouble on the street with this man last week. Ordered him away several times. Officer Connors sworn. Defendant has been stopping men going to work, and has warned him several times. Officer McCullough sworn. Have had complaints of this man putting up posters against the Government in regard to the strike.

Now, that is the testimony as set down in here, although that was not testified to.

Senator STERLING. You were present?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I was present.

Senator STERLING. When the proceedings were held against that man?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Do you say you did not hear any testimony such as that?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; the testimony was this: This man came out of a pool room and there was complaints by the pool-room keeper against threatening other people in that house, and they arrested this man as he came out.

Senator STERLING. Did your stenographer take down the testimony?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; he could not take down the testimony. They would not permit him to take it down. They would not talk loud enough for him to take it down.

Senator STERLING. Is that what you mean, that they would not talk loud enough for him to take it down?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. They would not talk loud enough for him to take it down or let him sit near enough or get near enough so that he could get it. Even at that, it is following further: "And now, upon full hearing"—before I go any further, I will say that I tried to examine them and they would not permit me. They would not let me ask any questions. I had two witnesses for this man, and the other witness with me was his friend, who came into the police station and inquired, and he was arrested, too. When he went in to inquire about this man he was arrested, and he was put behind the bars, and he paid \$5 that morning. And I said to the magistrate, "Can not I examine him?" He says, "No; I will do the examination," and all the examination he did was to ask him what his name was and whether he is a citizen, and did he work, and where he worked, and if he is a striker. This man happened to be a citizen, though it is not noted on the docket that he is not.

Senator WALSH. Is there a record of the findings of the magistrate?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And what does it say?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. That he finds him guilty of the offense.

Senator WALSH. Do you mean to tell me that there is no official record kept on any of these documents as to whether the man pleads guilty?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No; nothing is kept.

Senator WALSH. And they are all like this, simply after that question is a blank, and no such thing as arraigning a man in these courts and asking him if he is guilty or not guilty? Do you mean to tell me that?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No. There is no information at all made, and there is no paper outside of the calendar to give you any information about the man except after the hearing. Then this is made up. We have a book—

Senator WALSH. This is true in all of the cases.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. That is the practice in all of the magistrate courts here. It is an abominable practice, but that is it.

The CHAIRMAN. And was that the order of practice before the strike?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just the same before the strike?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Just the same before the strike.

Senator STERLING. And do you complain of the ordinances themselves, irrespective of the way it has been interpreted by your magis-

trate, or do you complain of it as being an unreasonable ordinance, this ordinance which authorizes the arrest of a man for being a suspicious person——

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I think that the ordinance is proper to arrest a man as being a suspicious character, but I claim that there is no such thing as suspicious persons. There ought to be a charge lodged against him in a reasonable length of time or he should be discharged. A suspicious person is because there is some suspicion of him doing something. It has been defined by one of the magistrate courts, that the only thing that they can do is to hold a man on suspicion for a reasonable time.

Mr. RUBIN. We could multiply these instances into the hundreds.

Senator WALSH. Of course, that is a matter that we would not deal with, but it is a matter which some one would make a local and national reputation if he would but expose it.

Mr. RUBIN. We are trying to show this up and let you know about it, to let you know about the intimidation and the partnership between the mill owners and the officials to break the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. But this has been carried on, according to this witness, for a long time. This is a practice which began before the strike.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That has no connection with the strike, and we are not here to investigate the courts of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. But with this exception, that before the strike it never happened to be that we were not permitted to examine the witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Then there is that difference.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Then there is that difference; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And no other difference?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No other difference.

Senator WALSH. Before the strike, was the man given a hearing? and you were permitted to cross examine and examine the witnesses?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes; I always did that.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is the one thing that is different since the strike?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. That is the one thing that is different since the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any more of that? We do not want to go into every one of these.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I want to call your attention to characteristics of this case. On the next day I was not at the police court for the simple reason that the hearing was changed to 7 o'clock in the morning instead of 8 o'clock, and I was late, and it was changed without any notice to me of the change that it would be at 7 o'clock.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been a practicing attorney?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Since January 5, 1905, 15 years. This hearing I was at was September 30th.

On October 1 I was not at the hearing, because the hour of the hearing was changed from 8 o'clock to 7 o'clock in the morning, and I live out in East Wellingsburg, and it takes me three-quarters of an hour to get there. I was there and got there before 8 o'clock, but the hearings were all over. I got ready for the hearing on October 1

and I was there to represent two parties. I asked the magistrate whether I would be permitted to examine the witnesses. He says "No." I think it is stated there that he called the various witnesses, and in this case I called four witnesses and he would not ask them any questions and when I started to say something he cut them short, and he fined these people \$25 or 30 days, two of them, and these people were arrested very peculiarly, by officer Lieut. Lewis on a warrant at 12:15 o'clock in the morning, October 2, 1919, and the hearing was held at 8 o'clock October 2, 1919.

Senator WALSH. What was the charge there?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. The charge was disorderly conduct, and the disorderly conduct, by their evidence, is this:

"Officer Lewis, sworn, says that he had numerous complaints of defendant going to workmen's homes on Arlington Avenue and telling their wives that if their husbands did not quit work they knew what would happen to them. This happened September 30, 1919."

Senator WALSH. Did you say that none of those defendants' wives were called to give testimony?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. None of the wives were called to give testimony.

Senator WALSH. And that was the only evidence against them?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. That was the only evidence, and here are those records, prepared in both of those cases. One fellow was taken out of his house in the middle of the night and the other was taken out of the boarding house on a warrant issued without any information, and I do not suppose there is any, and I will sue out a writ of certiorari.

Senator WALSH. Do you mean to say that, as attorney for the union men, you were refused the right to represent them on this occasion?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes, sir; I was told to get out from behind the railing, and they opened the door and told me to get out.

Senator WALSH. Do you mean that there was no complaint upon which to base the warrant?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I mean that there was no warrant. It is put in here "Arrested by officer, Lieut. Lewis, on warrant," but there was no warrant.

Mr. RUBIN. Would you say that there was discrimination made against the strikers in that court?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Absolutely.

Senator WALSH. How many similar cases of this character can you produce?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. I have 34 here, and 3 of them I have filed appeal and 12 of them I have been refused transcripts of.

Senator WALSH. How many of them have statements of hearsay like that?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. About 20 of them, I think. There are two or three of them that are justified; there was evidence. Probably 3 of them out of the 34 I have, but not for the magistrate. There should have been a charge made for assault and battery.

The CHAIRMAN. And of the 34, are they all convictions?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. All convicted.

Senator WALSH. Have you been in the court since the time that you were put out?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No.

Senator WALSH. Have you tried to appear there since?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Just what was said to you?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. They did not say that I should not appear. They said that I was there by courtesy and that I had nothing to do there. When I asked any questions I was jumped on.

Senator WALSH. You will pardon me for the question that I am about to ask you, but I know that young attorneys are sometimes impulsive. Let me ask you, were you courteous and considerate of the magistrate in every particular?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Absolutely.

Senator WALSH. And there was no complaint of your conduct?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes. There was afterwards. When I had Mr. Brennan call up Mr. Suttop, he said that I had offended him.

Senator WALSH. In what way?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. That is what I would like to know. I told you about what I said to him. When he asked this one man——

Senator WALSH. That was the day before——

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. These offenses occurred both the same day. The next day I had—no; the same day I had Mr. Glennan talk to them.

Senator WALSH. How many years have you been in practice?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Fifteen.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you ever had any trouble before?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. No, sir. Mr. Suttop told Mr. Brennan over the phone that I had offended him, and the only offense was what I told you there. After the hearing I talked to Commissioner Walsh about getting a transcript, and Commissioner Walsh told me that any transcript over five days old I could not get. I went to make a demand on him for the transcript. I said, "I want to make a demand on you for this transcript, because there is an act of the assembly which makes it a misdemeanor for you to refuse it. I demanded the transcript from the magistrate, and told him that it was a misdemeanor for him to refuse. He says, "Whatever the commissioner says goes with me. I stand by the commissioner."

I said "Mr. Suttop, this is a serious matter."

"Well," he says, "whatever he says goes." He said "If you are not insulting, not so insulting, we would probably get along better." I said——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You spoke of the judge having been in France. Was he a soldier?

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. Yes; he was a soldier. I said to him "If you were in France, as you were, and you were held before a magistrate and French was fired at you, I don't suppose you could get along." He says "Well, I did."

I says "I doubt it."

The CHAIRMAN. You have gone over that already.

Mr. SYPNIEWSKI. When he said that I had offended him and insulted him, I never insulted anyone in my life; I told him that I had never insulted anyone in my life; and the magistrate said "Well, you are so ignorant that you don't know when you do insult a person." That was the insult.

## TESTIMONY OF JACOB ROE.

JACOB ROE was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Roe, you are a lawyer?

Mr. ROE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. How many years have you been practicing?

Mr. ROE. Eight or nine.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you employed to look after the strikers who were arrested?

Mr. ROE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you go to McKeesport, to the office of the union there, for the purpose of consulting with clients?

Mr. ROE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell the Senate committee what happened to you and to the clients.

Mr. ROE. I have previously been to McKeesport to defend some strikers who were arrested on various charges, and I might say right here that I attempted, along with Mr. Brown, to get some McKeesport lawyer to defend some of these defendants, and I could not get a lawyer from McKeesport who will take their cases.

That is impossible. It is not a question of price or money. They won't defend these men. No McKeesport man will defend these fellows. So, consequently I was out there at the esquire's hearing there. I was directed to go from there to the headquarters of the Amalgamated, the American Federation of Labor, which is located on one of the principal streets in the city of McKeesport. The purpose of my visit there was to talk with them and take affidavits from the various members of the union to present to you gentlemen here, whom we contemplated might make us a visit. After I had dictated, or, rather, I had heard or dictated about 10 affidavits, three policemen appeared at the rear entrance of the door and notified us right there in the hall that we were under arrest. There were about 35 men waiting to give their depositions. Ten, as I have stated, had given their depositions, and one of these police officers then stepped to the head of the hall where we were located; that is myself, with a court stenographer, and Mr. Murphy, who had charge of that hall.

Senator STERLING. How many people were there assembled there at that time?

Mr. ROE. About 35 men besides myself.

They had assembled there, at my request, when I was sent out, because it was the most convenient way of getting their depositions in order to present them to you gentlemen. The police officers told these men that they were not arrested, but that Mr. Murphy and the court stenographer and myself were; and we were taken through the principal streets of McKeesport and up to the lockup. The only offense that we were arrested for was to try to present testimony to this court. I was there for a short time and I asked the chief of police what I was arrested for. He scratched his head and he said, "It is not your fault; you can go."

Senator WALSH. How long were you held in the station?

Mr. ROE. About 10 minutes.

Senator WALSH. Were you locked up at all?

Mr. ROE. No; we were just in the chief's private office.

Senator WALSH. You were just in the chief's private office?

Mr. ROE. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And this other man, Mr. Murphy?

Mr. ROE. Mr. Murphy and the stenographer and myself.

Senator WALSH. Did you explain to them that you were there trying to get evidence?

Mr. ROE. If I had said another word, he would have hit me over the head with a club.

Senator WALSH. Are these local officers?

Mr. ROE. After you have taken testimony of about 10 men in each one, telling your stories about getting their heads knocked off for doing nothing you are not going to take any chances with any of those police officers. I would sooner be here with a head on my shoulders than with a split head. I said then, "Is not there a place in this town where I can assemble my clients in order to get the testimony?" He said, "No; you get out of here; there is no meeting place for the strikers."

Senator WALSH. I suppose that he claims that this was a violation of some rule or order preventing a meeting?

Mr. ROE. I do not know anything about what he claims. That was later.

Senator PHIPPS. How big a hall was it and how long had it been the union headquarters?

Mr. ROE. I can state that from information. I am told that it had been for about 35 years.

Senator WALSH. How big a room is it?

Mr. ROE. It is not quite as large as this one—about three-quarters the size of this.

Mr. RUBIN. What experience have you had in other courts with strikers and officers?

Mr. ROE. Well, to make a long story short, they ask you are you a striker, and if you are not they let you go. They will ask you, "Are you a citizen?" "Yes." "Are you working?" "Yes." "Get out."

If you were not working, "\$10 or 10 days." "Ten or 10" is the way that they put it.

If anyone of you gentlemen can take the time to come, you will get better testimony and evidence than we can give. I will venture to say that if you will go there to-morrow—

Senator McKELLAR. Do they have court on Sunday?

Mr. ROE. They have court on Sunday.

### TESTIMONY OF MR. ANDREW PIDO.

ANDREW PIDO was thereupon called as a witness and, after being duly sworn, testified as follows:

Mr. RUBIN. How old are you?

Mr. PIDO. I am 23 years old.

Mr. RUBIN. Are you a striker?

Mr. PIDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Where do you live?

Mr. PIDO. 101 First Street, Clairton.



Mr. RUBIN. Did you have any trouble?

Mr. PIDO. Yes; I did have trouble. I have been arrested.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell what happened after you were arrested.

Mr. PIDO. On the 23d of September I was in a show and the other two guys with me—

The CHAIRMAN. Who were the other two guys?

Mr. PIDO. They were my friends, the best friend of mine, and the third one is a good friend of mine, and he was one of the borough officer's sons.

Senator PHIPPS. Was this in McKeesport?

Mr. PIDO. No; it was at Clairton. When we got out of the show, we started to walk down the street, and we stopped at the corner once, and the officer's son said that he was going to work. Well, when he said he was going to work, we told him "You do not have to tell us about it, that you go to work. If you are going to work, you can hurry along and go about it. You do not need to tell us about it. Some one is likely to jump you with a brick, and one might turn up." He said "You had better watch out and keep your clam shut." I said "Did I tell you anything wrong?" I just told him what might happen. He went away for four or five minutes; and later he came around with a deputy sheriff and one State trooper; and they came around here under corner and they took me in and they took me into the jail and they locked me in there, and they went out and in about 10 minutes later, Mr. Cunningham, the officer of Clairton, he comes back with his son, and he asks him, "Who is the fellow that told you that somebody might knock you in the head with the brick?" and he pointed me out in the cell. He said "Are you the one that is going to kill my son?" I said "No; I never killed anybody and I never want to." He said "I will show you right over here. Don't you try to make any noise." I did not say anything, and he told his son "You take your coat off and get ready and I will go in and get the key, and I will open that door, and we will knock the hell out of the son of a bitch"; and he did, too. And he opened that cell, and he told him, he says "Now, you go in there and beat him up good." And he says "I will." Then he says "If he touches you, I will knock him with that club I have got," and he had a little club there, a blackjack or whatever it is called. I did not move and I did not try to do anything, and I stand still and he stand around and punch me with the first. I did not want to fight; if he hit me with a club, he would make me bleed then; and I was standing there and he punched me in the face, and my face was all punched up.

Senator STERLING. Where was this?

Mr. PIDO. Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. You were under arrest?

Mr. PIDO. I was under arrest.

The CHAIRMAN. And he opened up the cell? Who opened up the cell?

Mr. PIDO. George Cunningham. He is an officer of Clairton.

The CHAIRMAN. He is a jailer? He had charge of the jail?

Mr. PIDO. I don't know. He ain't got no charge of the jail.

The CHAIRMAN. He had the key?

Mr. PIDO. He find the key in the desk some place and he opened it up.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the boy bigger than you are?

Mr. PIDO. He is bigger than you are?

Mr. PIDO. He is bigger than I am; 20 years old. If I was outside I would not let him beat me up; but I said I could not do nothing. The old man was there.

Senator McKELLAR. You were at a slight disadvantage, weren't you?

Mr. RUBIN. How badly were you beaten up?

Mr. PIDO. I couldn't open my mouth for three days.

The CHAIRMAN. You were pretty badly beaten up.

Mr. PIDO. And he beat me over here [indicating the face].

Mr. RUBIN. How long were you in jail?

Mr. PIDO. Eleven hours, from 11 in the evening until 10 in the morning. The next morning I called my cousins, two of them, and they come in and got me out and when they tried to bail me out, he asked how much the bail would be, and they told them \$2,000 and it would not be any less. I says, "I will stay here; I have not got that much money." Then he says, "You have got to go to Pittsburgh." And I says, "I will go down there." When I said that he called the burgess over, and the burgess said "Sixteen dollars will do," but the chief, Fred Young, said that would not do, and he got two charges against him; he said assault and battery and disorderly conduct, and \$30 will do therefor.

Senator WALSH. How much?

Mr. PIDO. \$30. And he took the \$30 and he told me to come back on the 6th of October in the evening. I come in there and I thought I was going to have a case and they postponed it until the 13th.

Mr. RUBIN. What happened to those that came to bail you out? Were they arrested, too?

Mr. PIDO. No.

Senator STERLING. Did you pay \$30?

Mr. PIDO. I put up a forfeit of \$30.

Senator McKELLAR. What nationality are you?

Mr. PIDO. Slavish.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you naturalized?

Mr. PIDO. I have got my first papers; that is all.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you going to finish those and become an American citizen?

Mr. PIDO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you get the first papers?

Mr. PIDO. In February, I think, the 25th.

Mr. RUBIN. This year?

Mr. PIDO. This year; yes.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you bought any Liberty bonds, to \$500.

The CHAIRMAN. You were not in the war?

Mr. PIDO. I was in the war. I tried to enlist in the Army this year, but they would not take me on account of an operation.

Senator STERLING. What wages do you get?

Mr. PIDO. I have been getting 50 cents for the last 16 months, and when they heard the strike was coming out they raised me to 55 cents and told me to work. I said to the boss, "If you did not raise

me when I asked you a couple of times I can not work now. It is too late to give me a raise. I will do what the rest of the people do." I like it better if I get eight hours a day. I don't go much after hours.

The CHAIRMAN. And you got 50 cents an hour——

Mr. PIDO. I got \$7 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you strike because——

Mr. PIDO. I never did. It is the first strike.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the reason you struck this time?

Mr. PIDO. I strike on eight hours a day and better conditions.

Senator McKELLAR. What sort of conditions do you want better?

Mr. PIDO. This better: I think that a man ought to work eight hours to-day and have eight hours sleep and eight hours that he can go to school and learn something; and I think that an education is much better than any money.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there any other matters that move you to strike except the eight hours a day?

Mr. PIDO. Well, when I was working I had a partner; he was on one shift and I was on the other, and I was doing all the job, and he was getting the pay. I was getting 50 cents an hour and he got 61.

Senator McKELLAR. How did that happen?

Mr. PIDO. Because he was a better friend of the boss than I was.

Senator McKELLAR. What are your relationships with the boss? Are they white to you?

Mr. PIDO. Well, I do not have much kick; but I was not very satisfied with them either. The first thing that was wrong, they would call me a Hunky. "If you don't think that is right you know what you can do."

Senator STERLING. You got 50 cents and your partner——

Mr. PIDO. Sixty-one.

Senator STERLING. Did you do exactly the same work?

Mr. PIDO. The same work.

Senator STERLING. And there was no difference in the work at all?

Mr. PIDO. There was no difference in the work at all.

Senator STERLING. Had he been working for the company longer than you?

Mr. PIDO. It may be—no; I do not think he did.

Senator STERLING. When did you begin to work for the company?

Mr. PIDO. I began—when I started in Clairton it was July 1, 1918.

Senator STERLING. 1918. And you do not know what time he started?

Mr. PIDO. He started in August, sometime.

Senator STERLING. In August, 1918?

Mr. PIDO. In August, 1918.

Senator STERLING. And you have been working longer than he had?

Mr. PIDO. One month.

Senator STERLING. And you do not know of any reason why he got more?

Mr. PIDO. The reason was that he was American born and I was not.

Senator STERLING. What was his name?

Mr. PIDO. Mickey Jones.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been going to school?

Mr. PIDO. I have been going to night school in Clairton for a while.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they a night school out there?

Mr. PIDO. They had in 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. Did a good many of the men go to night school?

Mr. PIDO. They don't have any chance. They work 12 hours a day, and they do not have any chance.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you go to night school?

Mr. PIDO. I went about 20 nights altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all of the schooling that you ever had?

Mr. PIDO. I did not have any chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all of the schooling that you have had in your life?

Mr. PIDO. That is all the schooling I have had in my life.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to go to school?

Mr. PIDO. Do I want to go to school? Certainly I want to go to school.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you learn anything at the night school of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. PIDO. Well, we have been learning a little bit, but we did not have a chance to learn but a little bit.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you read much of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. PIDO. I read the first grade of the book, because I did not know how to sign my name.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the school free? Do you have to pay?

Mr. PIDO. We pay a dollar for three months; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men went to the night school?

Mr. PIDO. Not very much. There were about 28 altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think they would go to night school if they had an opportunity?

Mr. PIDO. I think they would if they had a chance to go, but the way they are now there have no chance to go to school.

Senator McKELLAR. Not with the 12 or the 14-hour shifts?

Mr. PIDO. They work 10 hours a day and 14 a night, and they work a week about, and some of them work for two weeks, too.

The CHAIRMAN. What country are you from?

Mr. PIDO. I am from Galicia, Austria.

The CHAIRMAN. Under what government is that?

Mr. PIDO. I do not know where it now is. They are still fighting over there.

The CHAIRMAN. Your answer is a very good one. When it last had a government, what kind of government was it?

Mr. PIDO. Francis Joseph, Austria.

The CHAIRMAN. How does that government differ from this one?

Mr. PIDO. Well, it is so different. Out there they have a king and here we have a superintendent.

Mr. RUBIN. A superintendent?

Mr. PIDO. A superintendent or president.

The CHAIRMAN. Here they have what?

Mr. PIDO. A president.

Senator PHIPPS. Which plant were you working in at Clairton?

Mr. PIDO. At the coke works, Clairton Steel.

Senator WALSH. You say that you would like to have or that you are on a strike because you want an eight-hour day?

Mr. PIDO. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Do you think that your fellow workers prefer an eight-hour day, with less pay, than a 10 or 12 hour day with more pay? Do you think that they would want that?

Mr. PIDO. Well, I think the eight hours and more money.

Senator WALSH. Yes; you would want the eight hours with a little more money than you are getting now for the eight hours?

Mr. PIDO. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. But you would not expect 8 hours with the same pay that you would get for 12 hours?

Mr. PIDO. Of course; no.

Senator WALSH. Is that your feeling and is that the feeling generally among the men with whom you work, that they would like to have an eight-hour day?

Mr. PIDO. Yes; it is.

### TESTIMONY OF MIKE MESTROVICH.

Mike Mestrovich was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

Mr. RUBIN. Your name is Mike Mestrovich?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. You had an automobile?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. A Ford?

Mr. MESTROVICH. No; I have a Wheeler six.

Mr. RUBIN. You were arrested?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell us what they did with you and the automobile, and where it was.

Mr. MESTROVICH. The 21st day of September we had a meeting in Clairton, and we just started to proceed with the meeting, and five or six State troopers come to drive us away from there and clubbed the women and children and everything.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this the same meeting?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes, sir. I saw one trooper tear the flag up and trample over the flag and make me pretty bad feeling, and I went over there and I said he was not to do that with his own flag—I said if he would not respect his own flag that we would not respect anything else. Then I went home. A few of our men were arrested and I told Mr. Foster on the phone, I said, “Mr. Foster, we have got a few men arrested. What are you going to do?” He said, “Mike, if you could get some lawyer and you see what you could do.”

And also I went to Mr. Brumstrader and he said, “Mike, you are going down to the police station and see what you could do.” And I took him down in the police station and I took inside, and I was waiting outside and two officers come in and grabbed me and pulled me inside of the police station and searched my pockets, and I didn’t have nothing and one of the State troopers said to the other, “Did you search him?” He said, “Yes; I did.” He said, “Did you find anything on him?” He said, “No, sir; I did not.” He said, “Did you search him good?” He said, “Yes; I did.” He slapped

his left hand into my pocket and something was dropped in it and hit me and I shut my eyes and Mr. Brumstrader was present when he hit me, and I don't know what was going on like; and I don't know what the charge was against me, but they took me to the county jail. The next morning Mr. Brumstrader asked me about my head. He said, "How are you feeling this morning?" "It is pretty sore," I said, "and swelled up a little bit." I said, "What is the charge against me?" He said, "Carrying weapons and for disorderly conduct," and for something else; he didn't know what it was.

They kept me nine days in jail and at the same time this State man used my car that night to take prisoners to Pittsburgh and return with it to the same place that night, and the next day they took the car, on the 22d of September, and took it out again and used it until the 24th, until 4 o'clock Wednesday afternoon, and they do some damage in the car. When I came from jail a couple of days I got a letter from a vigilance committee.

Just one minute before I go into that. I have about \$2,500 bonds on me, and a few days after—it was on the last day of September or October 1—they sent me a letter. Here is the letter [producing letter].

Mr. RUBIN. It is in red typewriting. I will read it:

CLAIRTON, PA., October 1, 191 ---

MIKE MESTROVICH:

While our boys were risking their lives fighting the Kaiser, what were you doing?

You were an alien enemy then and you are an alien enemy now. We don't want any of your kind around here.

If you want to save your worthless hide, you had better leave this place before sundown tomorrow.

VIGILANCE COMMITTEE.

The CHAIRMAN. What nationality are you?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Slav.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I have taken out my first paper.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Nine years.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you get out the first papers?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Last year.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your age.

Mr. MESTROVICH. Thirty-four.

Senator WALSH. Who are the vigilance committee?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Here is the water mark of the Carnegie Steel Co. on the paper.

Senator WALSH. The country you came from, is that a part of Austria?

Mr. MESTROVICH. It belonged to Austria before.

Senator WALSH. Were you drafted in the Army.

Mr. MESTROVICH. I was registered, but they put me in the fifth class.

Senator WALSH. Why?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I do not know.

Senator WALSH. Was it supposed you were an alien enemy?

Senator STERLING. Were you willing to go to the war?

Mr. MESTROVICH. If I was called, yes, sir, I would do it.

Senator STERLING. Did you make a claim of any kind so that you would be put into the fifth class?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I did not make no claim, but I told them I was not a citizen and did not have no paper, and told them what country I belonged to, and they shoved me in fifth class.

Senator STERLING. You made a report out to the local board and they put you in the fifth class on that report?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. You did not make any claim for not being liable to go because you were an Austrian?

Mr. MESTROVICH. No.

Senator WALSH. Were you a worker in the mills?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I was a coal miner.

Senator STERLING. And you have never worked in the steel mills?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes, I did, last year, six months, for the Carnegie Steel Co.

Senator STERLING. What were you doing at the time of the strike?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I was helping Mr. Bogan, the local secretary.

Senator STERLING. As an organizer, were you?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. How long since you have been at work?

Mr. MESTROVICH. On that work, I had been since the 11th of August of this year.

Senator STERLING. And you were carrying on the campaign along with Mr. Brogan?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And trying to organize for the strike?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much per day did you receive?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I got \$7 a day.

Senator McKELLAR. What did you get at the coal mines when you were working there?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I did piecework there.

Senator McKELLAR. How much did you make a day when you were working in the coal mines?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Well, I make from \$50 to \$75 every two weeks, and work eight hours a day.

Senator McKELLAR. How much did you make in the Carnegie Steel mill?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Forty-six cents an hour.

Senator STERLING. How did you come to leave the coal mines?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I was sick and the doctor gave me the advice to work in the open air; to quit working in the mines.

Senator STERLING. You did not go back to work at all?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I went to work in the steel mill.

Senator STERLING. And you quit the steel mill?

Mr. MESTROVICH. No; I got discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. When?

Mr. MESTROVICH. On January 12.

Senator STERLING. On January 12?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What were you getting at the steel mill at the time of your discharge?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I had 46 cents an hour, and that made \$6.44 for 12 hours, and Sunday we worked 18 hours every Sunday.

Senator STERLING. Why were you discharged?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Because they found out I was a union man and belonged to the United Mine Workers.

Senator STERLING. Did they tell you that that was the reason you were discharged?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes; they said that that was the reason.

Senator STERLING. Who told you that?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Our employment man.

Senator STERLING. Can you tell the name of the man who told you that the reason you were discharged was because you belonged to the United Mine Workers?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Well, I will explain to you. On the 11th of January, where I was working, at 6 o'clock in the evening, and on January 12 I got started to go to dinner at 12 o'clock at noon, and I worked Monday morning at 6 o'clock, and my boss he was waiting for me, and he said, "I have got to discharge you." I said, "If you want to discharge me, you will be sorry." He said, "I did not do that. I am not the one who discharged you." I said, "Who did?" He said, "I got an order from the main office that they don't want you any more." I said, "Do you know any reason why?" He said, "I don't know."

Then I went to the employment office and I saw the general superintendent, Mr. McIntosh, and I said, "What did you discharge me for? I never have rested, and I do a day's work every day, and Sunday, too," and Mr. McIntosh said, "I do not know anything about it." I said, "You are the head man and you are supposed to know." He said, "I don't know."

Then I went to the main office; I went Monday in the main office and I asked them, "What is the reason you discharged me?" They said, "You are lazy and you do not want to work." I just pulled my record out and I had record No. 1. I said, "Mister," I said, "can I get record No. 1 if I do not want to attend to my job?" He said, "No." I said, "Here is record No. 1." He says, "You know the reason exactly, boy. We do not want to have you any more, and don't stay on company property. If you do, we will do something to you." Then one of the officers of the Carnegie Steel Co., the Carnegie Steel officers, grabbed me by the shoulder and pulled me outside. I demanded my money, and he said, "Come to-morrow. If you want to wait, all right. If you do not want to wait, get the hell out of here; don't stay on company property any more."

Senator STERLING. In all this they had not told you that you were discharged because you belonged to the United Mine Workers union, had they?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Well, they did not tell me directly. I want to ask about this here letter. I have \$2,500 bonds on me, and if I leave I leave the \$2,500, and if I stay I risk my life. I want to go away to the country; I have got to lose \$2,500, and if I want to stay here I lose my life.

Senator STERLING. That \$2,500 is for your appearance in court, is it?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Yes.



Senator STERLING. Do you know what you are to appear for there?

Mr. MESTROVICH. I don't know.

Mr. RUBIN. They are held to the grand jury.

Senator MCKELLAR. Why do you say that if you stay here you will lose your life?

Mr. MESTROVICH. Well, here is the letter.

Senator MCKELLAR. You are not bothered by letters—by anonymous letters?

Mr. MESTROVICH. What?

Senator MCKELLAR. You are not bothered by letters with no name signed to them?

Mr. MESTROVICH. No; but I do not know what would happen.

Senator MCKELLAR. You have not been hurt at all?

Mr. MESTROVICH. No; I have not been hurt yet, at all.

### TESTIMONY OF J. G. BROWN.

J. G. BROWN was thereupon called as a witness, and having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Senator MCKELLAR. That letter seems to be the Valley Paper Co.'s watermark instead of the Carnegie Steel Co.'s.

Mr. BROWN. They claim that it is the same sort of paper that the company uses.

Senator WALSH. This witness, so far as he knows, claims that it is the same sort of paper that the company uses.

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Brown, will you tell the committee your business, how long you have been here, and what you have been doing, and trace the history of the difficulties that you have had in the city of Pittsburgh?

Mr. BROWN. The stenographer has my name—J. G. Brown—J. G. Brown is my name. I have been an organizer for the American Federation of Labor. Just at the present time I am working for the national committee for organizing the iron and steel workers. I came to Pittsburgh about a year ago the 12th or 13th of this month, and since that time I have had a great deal of experience trying to hold meetings—trying to arrange to hold meetings, you know. If I had not had so many, probably I could talk better.

About a year ago this month—the 1st of November, perhaps, when the flu ban was lifted—we made the first effort to secure permission to arrange to hold the meetings in McKeesport. We rented a hall, and in the receipt we got for the hall rent was a condition requiring us to secure permission from the mayor before we could get the hall. I went with a couple of other fellows to see Mayor Lyle, and I talked the matter over with him and explained the purpose of the meetings that we were going to hold there, and he said that he would take the matter under advisement. We went to see him about a week later, or several days later, and he said that he had decided that it would be unwise to allow those meetings to be held. We later took the matter up with the city council there—

Senator WALSH. There were no strikes on at this time?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; nothing at all. The national committee had a special meeting in McKeesport, and the whole body went up to the city council and laid the case before them. At the conclusion of our hearing one of the councilmen made a motion that the mayor

be requested to reverse his decision and allow the meetings to be held. The motion was not even seconded. One of the councilmen asked the mayor if he thought there would be trouble if there was a meeting held, and he said he thought there would and had not changed his mind. So we got no satisfaction there. A few days after that I went over to Homestead and rented a hall, and I asked the fellow from whom I rented the hall if it was necessary to secure any permission before we could hold a meeting. He said that he did not think so, and if I cared to I could go and see the borough clerk. I did that, and he said I would have to see the burgess. I saw the burgess in company with another man and asked him if we could hold the meeting. He said, "Well, you can not hold any meetings at Homestead." I said, "Why not?" He said, "In the first place, you can not get a hall."

"Well," I said, "we have a hall. We have got a hall, all right."

"Then," he said, "what do you want of me?"

I said, "We want to arrange to have a band play on the street and distribute some advertisements."

He said, "There will be no bands play on the streets of Homestead and no advertising done."

I said, "Well, now, could not we pass cards around to the houses, or something of that sort?"

"No, sir," he said, "you can not pass anything in any way."

"Could not we advertise in the papers?" I said.

"Oh, yes," he said, "if you want to; if you can get the space. I don't think you can get the space."

So the matter dropped at that, and the next morning I was called and told that a mistake had been made, that the hall had been rented to some one else, and was rented to me by mistake, and they very much regretted the proposition, but they would have to cancel that lease.

Senator STERLING. Had a lease been procured at that time?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I had a lease.

Senator STERLING. I think you said a while ago that on your making inquiry it had been suggested that you see the burgess?

Mr. BROWN. That was after I rented the hall.

Senator STERLING. Was it a written or a verbal lease?

Mr. BROWN. It was a written receipt.

Senator STERLING. I understood that you asked in the first place if you had to get a permit—

Mr. BROWN. I think you misunderstood me, Senator. At least, I meant to say that I went and rented the hall and inquired of the man if it was necessary to secure a permit. He said that he did not think so, but I might make inquiries from the clerk. I did that, and he said that I had better see the burgess, because he had the matter entirely in his hands.

So we did not hold any meetings at McKeesport until about a month after that. We finally got a Turner Hall over there one night without a permit. While we were holding the meeting two policemen came down, borough policemen, and according to the story that the manager told us the next day, asked why they had allowed us to meet there, and told him that he must not allow us to meet there any further without a permit of the burgess.

Senator STERLING. Were you present at this meeting?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; and, by the way, it was the first labor meeting held in Homestead in 26 years.

Senator STERLING. What was the date of that meeting?

Mr. BROWN. That was in December.

Senator STERLING. Last?

Mr. BROWN. Last year. I do not just recall the date; I could look it up and find the date. We held no further meetings there until—

Senator WALSH. Pardon me for interrupting you. Did you find out whether there was a city regulation for holding meetings?

Mr. BROWN. No; I did not. I understood, the burgess told us in the first instance that there was not any and we could go ahead and hold the meetings if we could get a hall, and in that case, as in other cases, something always happened if we—if it is not the city ordinance it is the hall keeper, and if it is not the hall keeper it is the sheriff's orders, but there is always something that just happens that prevents us from holding a meeting.

Senator WALSH. But with that meeting, you were allowed to proceed with that meeting?

Mr. BROWN. We were allowed to proceed with that meeting, but we could not get a hall for any future meetings because of the reasons assigned. They said that while the burgess did not require a permit on our part he did on their part, as he warned the hall keepers—and it was true of every hall keeper in town—that they must not lease their hall to the labor organization without a permit from the burgess. A little later on we went out to Braddock, and we got a hall out there, and they told us we had better see the burgess. We went to see the burgess, and he decided that he would take it up and talk it over and let us know later on, and about a week after that said no, we could not have it. However, inasmuch as we had the hall rented and paid for, we decided we would hold the meeting anyhow.

A few days after that they sent us back the hall rent and said in view of the fact that there would be likely to be trouble we had better not try to hold a meeting. We expected a crowd there—it was only the day before the meeting that we got the notice. We went into the adjoining borough of Rankin with another fellow, and I said, "We had better find out if we are going to have any trouble before completing the arrangements." We saw the burgess. He said, "Anything satisfactory to the chief of police is all right with me." We saw the chief of police and told him what our object was—to go ahead.

Senator STERLING. That is at Rankin?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; just a neighboring borough. He told us to go ahead. On the night in question we rented a hall and everything was going on all right, and we stationad a man at the hall in Braddock for the purpose of advising men who came to go to Rankin, and we went to Rankin, and just as we went to go into the hall we noticed a placard. It said on the placard, "Closed by the board of public health." We did not hold any meeting there.

Senator STERLING. What date was this?

Mr. BROWN. I should judge the 10th of January or along about there. We said this may be some mistake or joke or something, and we hunted up the chairman of the board of public health and he assured us that it was no joke. He said the "flu" was coming along

and they did not allow it, and that they were going to close the saloons.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the "flu" prevalent at that time?

Mr. BROWN. Well, that was the reason he gave.

Across the street in the church there was a church festival going along that night, a colored church, and 100 feet the other way was another church festival the same night, and they did not close the saloons the next morning there. We held no meetings anywhere in any of these steel towns last year except the one I spoke of at Homestead. We were able to hold meetings here in the city of Pittsburgh by securing permits from the public safety department, I think it is called.

This year we renewed our efforts to hold meetings in McKeesport. Local political influences were brought to bear upon the mayor there; the governor, I think, wrote him a letter, and others offered him suggestions that it would be the best thing to do, but in spite of that we were not able to get a permit, so we started holding meetings on the street, and they were not interrupted for several weeks. Finally the mayor notified our representative out there that we would have to cut out these meetings.

Senator STERLING. How frequently were you holding these meetings?

Mr. BROWN. Every Sunday we held the meeting. We went out and had some talk with the mayor, several conferences with him. Finally he said that if we would cut out the foreign speakers we might hold meetings there with his permission, and we declined to agree to that, taking the position that our men had to interpret anything the English speakers said, inasmuch as these men would barely understand what our program was; but he would not agree to it; so finally some of the men here in town that we were in negotiations with said, "Go ahead and agree to it. That don't mean anything anyhow. He is just in a kind of a hole and wants to get out of it in as good grace as possible." Without consenting to it in so many words, we went up and got a permit from the mayor, which stipulated that we might hold meetings on specific dates provided no foreign speakers were used, and that a list of the speakers was submitted to him before the meeting was held.

So we submitted to him the names of all of the officers of the American Federation of Labor and as many of the men that we could think of in this vicinity engaged in that work, and explained to him that any of them might be called upon, and went on and put on the foreign speakers and nothing was done about it until about the middle of August, I guess. We had been holding regular weekly meetings in the halls, you understand, but at those meetings I suggest there were from 100 to 500 bosses, so they said, that stood around the gates and watched the men that went in there, sort of kept notes and that sort of thing. We held the meetings, however, until, as I say, about the early part of or the middle of August. One day we were notified that no more permits would be issued, that the mayor felt it was unwise to allow any further public meetings. We thereupon went and tried to hold the meeting and explain to these men why we were prevented from going in the hall. Two of our men were arrested, when they asked the privilege of getting

upon the steps and explaining to the large crowd gathered there why we could not hold the meeting in the hall, that it had not been permitted, and they were arrested. Following their arrest, considerable disorder developed, the men were pretty indignant, and did not know what it was about. They saw these organizers being placed in jail. I was not out there that particular night, but the information we had was they marched around and made considerable noise, and finally I went down toward the mills, and there were some stones thrown at the mill, I think, or something of that sort, and some of these men were arrested, a part of them, at any rate, and they were arrested on a misdemeanor, and they were held on \$3,000 bail.

Senator WALSH. What was the misdemeanor?

Mr. BROWN. That was the only charge.

Senator WALSH. That is not the charge?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. It was not disorderly conduct?

Mr. BROWN. No; it was just misdemeanor; misdemeanor—that was the specific charge. They were held in \$3,000 bail. Our attorney, Mr. Brennen, went up and presented a petition for a reduction of the bail, and it was reduced to \$2,000, and bail was furnished and they were released.

Senator McKELLAR. Were the men who were arrested men who worked in the plants?

Mr. BROWN. They were men who were working at the works there, they were steel workers.

Senator McKELLAR. Were they working in the plant?

Mr. BROWN. I think that some of them were then working.

Senator WALSH. Some of your organizers?

Mr. BROWN. None of them were organizers. They were all local workmen in McKeesport.

Senator PHIPPS. Will you please fix the date of this occurrence, when stones were thrown and seven men were arrested?

Mr. BROWN. I do not know that I can fix it exactly. It was in the early part of August.

Senator WALSH. Before the strike?

Mr. BROWN. Before the strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Did that occurrence take place at one of the gates of the National Tube Works?

Mr. BROWN. Where the speakers were arrested?

Senator PHIPPS. No—where the stones were thrown?

Mr. BROWN. I do not know just where it was. I will have to tell you the general story, so as to make each fit in.

Senator PHIPPS. We heard of that occurrence yesterday while we were in McKeesport, and I wanted to know if this was the occurrence.

Mr. BROWN. I could not give it to you in direct testimony.

Mr. BRENNEN. It was the same.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that in August or September?

Mr. BROWN. It was in August, I can definitely state that. I know the time, but the details I do not know. I heard of those instances regarding the application they made for bail. Well, later on, we asked the men to meet at the commons—

Senator PHIPPS. You asked the mayor?

Mr. BROWN. No; the men, out on the commons, and we tried to get two lots for the men out there to meet there. We went out there, and

the police said, in spite of the fact that we had the owner's permission, that we would be arrested.

Senator WALSH. At this time was your union organizing, and were you looking for men?

Mr. BROWN. We were carrying on this organization campaign. We just organized them in our general work, and as we got enough of machinists, for instance, we turned those over to the machinists and we formed a local union.

Senator WALSH. And at no time had the work of organizing reached that development where you would form separate units of men in separate movements?

Mr. BROWN. Some of it.

Senator WALSH. This meeting, was that a meeting of union men alone, or was it union men and other men that might want to join the union, or whom you might want to urge to join?

Mr. BROWN. It was anybody; it was a mass meeting.

Senator PHIPPS. That followed the McKeesport occurrence?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And it was a week or so later?

Mr. BROWN. It was a week or so later. We said, "In order to avoid trouble we will go outside of the borough." So we got the boys to march down, I presume a couple of miles, into the other adjoining borough, Glassport. So we saw a hillside there with nobody on it, and we went up on that and held our meeting there, and we held it there on the following week, and that week one of the policemen from Glassport said, "Now, you fellows had better get a lease on this property or you will find somebody else has done it, and you will be shut out here."

So a couple of days after that we did that. We did not get a lease, so we took an option on the place with the privilege of using it. We tried to hold a meeting there on September 21. I was not there, but that meeting was broken up by the State police, and quite a number of men were arrested, and they were held in \$2,000 bail, I believe.

So much for McKeesport. We were not able to hold a meeting in McKeesport. We were not able to pass bills in McKeesport; we were not able to stand three together in McKeesport and tell what was going on. We have absolutely no method by which we can conform to the various laws to communicate with our men.

Senator WALSH. How about advertising in the newspapers?

Mr. BROWN. We tried our best to advertise in the newspapers at different times, but it was an impossibility.

Senator WALSH. They would not take the advertisements?

Mr. BROWN. They would not take the advertisements.

Senator MCKELLAR. What became of the seven men who were arrested?

Mr. BROWN. They were taken up to the grand jury and they are there.

Senator MCKELLAR. They are not still in jail, are they?

Mr. BROWN. No; they are out on bail.

Mr. RUBIN. They are being held to the November term of the grand jury.

Senator STERLING. There were complaints for them?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; the general charge of misdemeanor and nothing else alleged until the grand jury meets, and they will be released or indicted.

Senator STERLING. If that was the only charge against them, would you have to wait for the grand jury before you could secure their release?

Mr. BROWN. They were released.

Senator STERLING. They were released from custody and out on bail?

Mr. BROWN. I am not a lawyer, Senator, but as I understand it, nothing can be done until the grand jury makes some disposition of the cases.

Senator STERLING. I should think that you would know, although you are not a lawyer, that misdemeanor is no charge, because there are perhaps 100 different kinds of misdemeanor under the city ordinances.

Mr. BRENNEN. When the magistrate, or in this case the mayor, took the information, in the information is made a misdemeanor, and he reports it to the court, and he commits the man to jail on the charge of a misdemeanor, and when it comes to the grand jury, before the grand jury, it will be charged with a riot, on inciting a riot, or unlawful assemblage.

Senator STERLING. Is that the law of the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRENNEN. That is the law of the State of Pennsylvania.

Senator STERLING. That a man can be charged before a magistrate with having committed a misdemeanor?

Mr. BRENNEN. They are doing it here.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Rubin, you are a lawyer?

Mr. RUBIN. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And you are a lawyer in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. RUBIN. No.

Senator STERLING. But you ought to know what the practice is in this State.

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Brennen has been a lawyer here all his life.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it the law or is it not the law?

Mr. BRENNEN. It was the law, and it was not the law at the time of the hearing. When the information would describe what the offense is, that the charge is misdemeanor, and in the information they say wat transpired, like in this case that they were disorderly, throwing stones, and other characteristics of a riot.

Senator STERLING. The information states that in the first instance and a warrant issues on that information?

Mr. BRENNEN. The commitment here recites a misdemeanor.

Senator STERLING. The commitment might do that possibly, but I am speaking of that document which initiates the proceedings, which is the complaint or the information.

Senator WALSH. Are they asked to plead to a complaint?

Mr. BRENNEN. The information is made, and previous to the hearing you are asked to plead guilty or not guilty, and the Commonwealth puts in its side of the case, and the defense puts in his side.

Senator WALSH. When the defendant is asked to plead guilty or not guilty, is the offense read to him? And can not you as a lawyer go before the case comes up and see the complaint, so that you will know the charge?

Mr. BRENNEN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Well, how can you explain this, then?

Mr. BRENNEN. Well, this is a case where a man is arrested on view, and there is no information made, and he is brought before the magistrate, and the magistrate hears the case, and if it develops something that would justify an information, information is made, and if it does not, he is summarily disposed of.

Senator WALSH. And instead of having the officer or the person complaining go before the magistrate and giving the information and have a warrant issued, you can take a man before the magistrate and decide whether they shall issue a complaint or not?

Senator STERLING. I was making a distinction between McKeesport and the testimony in regard to the Pittsburgh practice.

Mr. RUBIN. I have raised that question in the Butler County court of common pleas, and the judge held the meaning of the offense of trespass was sufficient to hold them and bind them over to the grand jury. The statute provides for trespass as an offense here. If I brought a distinction between trespass and unlawful trespass—there is a distinction, because trespass is a civil action, the court held that to name an offense is sufficient to hold the men.

Senator STERLING. If an information is filed against the man, simply charging him with a misdemeanor, and a warrant is issued, and that man is held to answer and put in prison, his release could be secured on habeas corpus.

Mr. RUBIN. It ought to be.

Senator PHIPPS. You say that you are not a worker in the mills?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You have been here about a year?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your home? Where is your home?

Mr. BROWN. Well, my home now is in Pittsburgh.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, where was it formerly?

Mr. BROWN. At Seattle.

Senator PHIPPS. What was your business in Seattle?

Mr. BROWN. Well, I worked for the Government for about 15 months before I left there.

Senator PHIPPS. Up to the time of your leaving Seattle, what was your position with the Government?

Mr. BROWN. Well, I was in the United States Employment Service.

Senator PHIPPS. And on your coming here, before you came or after you arrived here, your employment became that of organizer for the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. May I ask a few questions about that legal matter? In my State no officer can arrest a man without having in his pocket a warrant, which he must show to the man, or without taking him in the act of committing a crime, and then the man arrested, the moment he is brought before a court a warrant is exhibited and the arrest is made upon some complaint. I understand you to say that the officer does not need to have a warrant, but he could pick up anybody and bring him before a magistrate, have him tried—

Mr. BRENNEN. That is the practice. The officer must have some excuse for doing it, and he makes him a suspicious person, and he



comes up before the magistrate. He says, "What is it? S. P.?" Then he testifies as to what the reasons were on which they arrested the man.

Senator McKELLAR. As I understand it, there is a statute introduced in 1869, which provides that a suspicious person may be arrested?

Mr. RUBIN. Or an ordinance.

Senator McKELLAR. Did I understand you to say you had worked in any of the plants, Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; I have not. I will say to you, as I said before, that when we want to hold meetings something always happens. We would wait on the sheriff and ask him why we could not hold meetings. He would say, "You can hold meetings in the halls if you can get the halls."

Senator McKELLAR. What place was this?

Mr. BROWN. In Pittsburgh, the sheriff of Allegheny County. In McKeesport, however, the local authorities prohibit you from holding the meetings. We went over to Glassport and we got the permission of the burgess, but we could not get the sheriff's. In one case it was the mayor, and in another case it was the sheriff, and in the other it was the board of health. In Duquesne, for instance, we went out half a dozen times and held meetings, but we have never been able to hold meetings in Dusquesne, after a year's effort—

Senator WALSH. Are there any members in Duquesne; are there any members of the union?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Senator WALSH. About how many?

Mr. BROWN. I do not know. The national committee does not undertake to keep track of the members.

Senator McKELLAR. Who has got this list of members?

Mr. BROWN. Well, the different local unions. There are 24 of these international unions cooperating in this campaign.

Senator McKELLAR. Could not the heads of these 24 international unions give us the number they have and where they are from?

Mr. BROWN. They might. But even that would be difficult. Here is a machinist union located in this town, for instance. Well, the national committee gets 200 additional members for that machinists' union, and they turn them into that local, and they just say, here are more members, and they do not classify where they come from.

Senator McKELLAR. How many have they got altogether?

Mr. BROWN. They can tell how many they have got altogether, I imagine. The machinists' union can tell you how many members they have in any place, and so can the others, but the national committee it meets—for instance, it goes into a town and starts in to organize and they have 2,000 men, say, and 300 of those are machinists, and the machinists come along and they organize the local. Then instead of the additional members, they may go to the national committee or to the local union, so it is impossible for the national committee to have specific knowledge of exactly how many men there are in a union.

Senator McKELLAR. How many strikers are there?

Mr. BROWN. That would be a difficult thing to say. I could not say.

Senator STERLING. Do you know a great many of those who went out on strike have gone back at McKeesport?

Mr. BROWN. Well, no, except the general newspaper talk, and I have had experience with the newspapers that leads me not to accept as gospel what I see in the Pittsburgh newspapers.

Senator STERLING. Would you admit that quite a number of them who went out have gone back?

Mr. BROWN. I might say, for the sake of argument, that they have, but the others have come out, and they go back in some places and they come out in others.

Senator STERLING. I suppose that you have your account of the situation, more or less, in regard to the number of men going in and coming out. What is your best impression, Mr. Brown, as to that?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to you this, Mr. Senator: I think you will agree that when you can not hold a meeting, when you can not talk to more than two of them at a time, and when the headquarters are closed up because there are 30 men in them, that it is pretty hard to keep your hand in close touch with the situation. You have no way of getting any information of that kind except to stand on the street alone and to look the thing over and to draw our own conclusions. That is an honest statement of it, and as good as we can get the information.

Senator STERLING. But you can get in communication with the men who are on strike at Clairton and McKeesport?

Mr. BROWN. I could go and find out one man. I went out to Clairton with Attorney Brennan to get some bail for a man out there who was held for participating in that meeting on the 21st of September. Well, Mr. Brennan went down to get a release on the bond signed by the burgess, working the mill, and I stopped to fix my machine, and he went down without me. While I was fixing that machine two State police—I was talking to about half a dozen men perhaps—who had stopped on the street to give me such information as you are asking me for now, to give me that knowledge. They came up and jabbed these fellows in the ribs with their sticks and followed them for about 20 feet. One of them walked up to me and said, 'You son of a b——, what are you doing here in Clairton, anyway?' I said, 'I am fixing this machine just now.' He said, 'Now, if you know what is good for you, get out of Clairton just as quick as you can, and don't try to start anything in Clairton.'

Senator STERLING. When was this?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, about the 24th of September, I should judge, the 23d or 24th, something like that.

Senator STERLING. Have you been a worker yourself in the steel mills?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. And what is your union, Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. Timber worker.

Senator STERLING. Timber worker?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And that is where your union is the strongest—where is it?

Mr. BROWN. Probably in the northwestern part of the country. There is where the biggest timber belt is.

Senator STERLING. Out in the States of Washington and Oregon?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you were with the—associated with the timber workers there?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. When did you become a member of the timber workers' union?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, I suppose nearly 20 years ago.

Senator STERLING. And were you yourself in the timber work?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, yes; that is all I have done.

Senator STERLING. And you say that recently, however, you were engaged by the United States Government in the Federal Employment Service?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How long were you in the Federal Employment Service?

Mr. BROWN. Well, from the time it started until the failure of Congress to make the necessary appropriation to carry on its work and caused it to suspend. When they cut off our pay, we could not go along further.

Senator STERLING. How long were you with the Federal Employment Service, all told?

Mr. BROWN. I should judge—they started this War Emergency United States Employment Service in Seattle, and when they started it I became identified with it at the time it started. That was in the early part of December, I think, 1917.

Senator STERLING. And what was your compensation?

Mr. BROWN. Two hundred and fifty dollars a month.

Senator STERLING. Was that wholly paid by the Federal Government or was it partly paid by the State?

Mr. BROWN. It was entirely paid by the Federal Government.

Senator STERLING. Did you have anything to do with the securing of employees for the shipbuilding service?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And for what district were you securing—what shipbuilding district were you securing the employees for?

Mr. BROWN. Well, they got men for any district that needed them. Of course, they were located there in Seattle. I can perhaps give you more of a general idea of it. I did not work entirely in Seattle, although that was my official station or residence. I help them organize various other offices in Aberdeen and Tacoma more particularly.

Senator STERLING. But it was all what was known as the Puget Sound shipbuilding district?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And your work was all in that district?

Mr. BROWN. My work was all in that district.

Senator STERLING. Now, were you seeking to get union men for work in that district?

Mr. BROWN. Well, they started that employment service with this understanding, that where union agreements had existed that the efforts of the Government would be to carry out the spirit of those

agreements, so that where there was a union agreement between a shipbuilding concern and the union, before the Government take it over they insisted that the terms of that agreement should be complied with for the balance of the employment.

Senator STERLING. And you were conveying that information to men who were seeking employment in the shipbuilding service, namely, that they should belong to a union?

Mr. BROWN. Only in union plants, Senator.

Senator STERLING. Only in union plants?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you not have regard, notwithstanding that, to the need of the Government for shipbuilders, and that the Government would be willing to accept any shipbuilder, whether he was a union man or not?

Mr. BROWN. Well, the Government had plenty of opportunity to employ everybody that came along. If they were to work in a union yard, where there was an agreement, they had to belong to a union; and if they were not a member of the union, they could take them in a nonunion shipyard.

Senator STERLING. Did you maintain an office in any of these places—in Seattle?

Mr. BROWN. Well, not individual office, but I was in the general Government office. I did not have any individual office.

Senator STERLING. But there was a general Federal Employment Service office?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. At Seattle?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And your work was in that office?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; with this exception, as I say, I worked in a number of the other offices at different times, to help them to get it organized, and that sort of thing.

Senator WALSH. I think, Mr. Witness, that there is a small difference—at any rate, there would be in my mind—between a refusal to hold a meeting of men who are already in the union and a meeting for the sole purpose of organizing a union. I do not know that there would be much difference, but I think it is a very serious offense when men are not permitted to hold a meeting of their own union.

How many of these meetings that you attempted to hold were meetings of union men, pure and simple, and about how many were of the others?

Mr. BROWN. The mass meetings were held usually once a week in the different places—that is, that was our general purpose. The organization meetings were held according to the needs of the organization. We usually held them once a week, too, or every two weeks. It did not make any difference, the organization meetings as well as the other meetings were stopped; and in McKeesport they would not allow us to hold meetings under any kind of arrangement.

Senator WALSH. You were going to make other arrangements—

Mr. RUBIN. I think that I can help you out. The union meeting is a closed meeting.

Will you tell about some of the ones where the meetings were presented?

Mr. BROWN. They were not exactly—I can say, for instance, at Homestead here, a week or 10 days ago, the bridge and the structural ironworkers had a local meeting of their organization, and only those members of that organization were admitted, and they had to have a password; and the members of the State constabulary forced their way into that meeting and sat through the entire proceedings of the meeting, and that meeting had to be held in such a circumscribed fashion as their presence made necessary.

Mr. RUBIN. Were those men out on strike?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; I suppose they were.

Senator WALSH. And they were meetings held in this hall for the purpose of discussing their strike situation?

Mr. BROWN. They were held for the purpose of doing their regular local business.

Mr. RUBIN. And doing the business of their union.

Mr. BROWN. Now, in Duquesne—I must tell you something about Duquesne. In Duquesne they have a commission form of government. One of those commissioners is a man by the name of James S. Crawford. He is also president of the city council, also mayor of the town, and he is also the magistrate of the town, and he is also president of the First National Bank of the town. His brother is president of one of the steel mills in McKeesport. We made several trips out to see Mr. Crawford. I made one and others made repeated trips to arrange with him to hold meetings, and we have never yet held one. When this thing came up in court an appeal was taken on the arrest of one of the men that had gone out and rented a lot. The police kept everybody off the lot and arrested them if they would congregate on the street. Here is my testimony before the court. The mayor—

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us what it is in a general way without reading that testimony?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I can tell you without referring to that transcript of the testimony. The only thing is that this testimony was not adverted to and I thought probably it would be a specific case. This here is the whole testimony in the case. I went to see the mayor and I told him what our purpose was, and I could not get him to agree to it. He charged or insinuated that this was an I. W. W. proposition or something like that, and I asked him if it would be any use to have Mr. Morrison come out to see him. He was expected to be in Pittsburgh and it would aid him to form a correct conclusion of the organization, and we could arrange to have them come to see him. He said, "It won't do you any good. Jesus Christ can not hold a meeting in Duquesne." And I rather think he was right.

He said, "No, Jesus Christ can not come in and have a meeting here in Duquesne. It won't do any good to send anybody out."

"Did he qualify that by what purpose Jesus Christ might be able to come and meet the people?"

"No; he did not go into details."

There is the situation labor is up against. Labor is up against a brace game in the Pittsburgh district. You can hold meetings

for any other purposes here very easily. I read in the paper yesterday where some Senator was talking to some man in Homestead and one of the strikers said to him, "Look out. You will get arrested because you are not complying with the proclamation of the sheriff, and there was more than three in the gathering." Senators can hold a meeting in McKeesport or Duquesne or Homestead, at any time. This law, you must understand, only applies to union men and workmen and strikers. We are circumscribed even in the city of Pittsburgh here; and the only way that we can hold the meetings is by sufferance, by permission from the mayor or the deputies, and in the labor temple. Granting permission to hold a meeting in the labor temple, carries the authority with it to refuse that; and I say when labor organizations can not hold meetings except by sufferance, then I say that the institutions of this country are in very grave peril. I do not think that any official ought to be clothed with authority to presume—now, then, this presumption that there will be disorder is entirely without foundation. Not a single meeting that we have been permitted to hold in this district has resulted in any disorder. I saw here an instance of some things that are happening here in this district, that organized labor is up against. There is a photograph of the State constabulary riding their horses into a private place of business [exhibiting a photograph].

The CHAIRMAN. Were those photographs at Washington? I think that we had a part of them.

Mr. BROWN. No; I do not think so.

There is one of them riding on the sidewalk in McKeesport [exhibiting photograph]; and here is the most striking picture of all. There is a photograph of a man—there is no disorder—there is a street scene in Homestead. The statement at the bottom of that is not true. That occurred at 532 Dixon Place, Homestead. There is a street scene, and there is a dozen people or so on one side of the street and nobody on the other. You will note there is one of the State constabulary in the act of hitting a man. He was the hotel keeper, not a striker, and had no interest in the strike, but he was clubbed, and this other man walking away was also clubbed; and here are those men's affidavits, and those men themselves are here this morning.

Senator STERLING. What was the date of these occurrences?

Mr. BROWN. September 21 it was published in the New York Times. The date is there. The 28th. The affidavit will tell. It was on the 23d day of September. This man's name being clubbed is Rudolph Dressel, and he keeps a hotel at 532 Dixon Street.

The CHAIRMAN. You will put those affidavits in the record?

Mr. BROWN. Would it be all right to put copies in? I would like to keep the originals. We want them for other uses.

The CHAIRMAN. You will furnish copies?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; very gladly.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will introduce those into the record and permit you to remove them in order that you may substitute copies.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I will be very glad to do that.

(The affidavits above referred to are here printed in full in the record as follows:)

HOMESTEAD, PA., October 9, 1919.

Name: Rudolph Dressel, 532 Dickson Street, Homestead, Pa.

Business: Hotel keeper.

Shown in picture appearing in New York Times of September 28 as man standing directly in front of horse of State policeman.

I, Rudolph Dressel, of the aforesaid address, do hereby make this statement of my own volition and without solicitation from anyone. That on the 23d day of September I was standing in front of my place of business at the aforesaid address and a friend of mine, namely, Adolf Kuehnemund, came to visit me and consult me regarding personal matters. As I stood as shown in the picture above mentioned with my friend the State constabulary on duty in Homestead came down Dickson Street. They had occasion to ride up and down this street several times and finally stopped directly in front of me and demanded that I move on. Before I had time to comply I was struck by the State policeman. (The attitude of said policeman is plainly shown in the aforesaid picture, and his threatening club is plainly seen descending toward me.)

My friend and I then entered my place of business, and my friend a few minutes afterwards looked out on the street over the summer doors. The policeman immediately charged him, and being unable to enter my place on horseback dismounted and entered my place of business on foot.

My friend being frightened because of what happened to me retired to a room in the rear of my place of business. The policeman entered this room, accompanied by another State policeman, and without cause, reason, or excuse, struck my friend and immediately thereafter arrested him.

I was personally present at his hearing before Burgess P. H. McGuire of the above city at which none of the aforesaid policemen were heard or even present. Burgess asked my friend what he was arrested for, and my friend referred to me, inasmuch as he himself did not know. The burgess immediately replied, "We have no time to hear your witnesses," and thereupon levied a fine of \$10 and costs upon him. My friend having posted a forfeit of \$25 the sum of \$15.54 was deducted therefrom.

My friend also at that time requested a transcript from the said burgess, and offered the usual fee for the same, and the said burgess replied, "We have no time to write transcripts." He made similar demands upon the said burgess upon five or six successive days, and the same reply was given each time. He was therefore compelled to engage counsel in order to procure same, and after much delay and argument was finally granted the same.

(The laws of this Commonwealth require an appellant on summary conviction to procure and enter his transcript in the proper appellate court within five days after judgment.)

I am in no way interested in the present strike of the steelworkers, but I am interested in having my person protected. I am a citizen of the United States and have been engaged in Allegheny County for the past 25 years. I never was arrested, and have always considered myself a respected citizen of this community. I am also a freeholder in this city, and have been for the past 16 years.

RUDOLPH DRESSEL.

Witnesses:

A. C. HEPP,

R. W. RILEY.

HOMESTEAD, PA., October 9, 1919.

I, Adolph Kuehnemund, residing at 120 East Fourth Avenue, Homestead, Pa., do hereby make this statement of my own volition and without solicitation from anyone. That on the 23rd day of September I came down Dickson Street to see my friend, Rudolph Dressel, regarding some personal matters. I met the said Rudolph Dressel in front of his place of business at 532 Dickson Street, Homestead, Pa. While conversing with him I noticed the State constabulary on duty in Homestead riding up and down Dickson Street. They finally stopped directly in front of him and I having noticed their coming moved a short distance from the curb. They immediately ordered my friend to move on, and before the words were even out of the policeman's mouth I heard a dull thud which I later learned to have been caused by said policeman's club coming in contact with and striking my friend. (The attitude of the said policeman and the position of the respective parties is plainly shown

in a picture appearing in the New York Times, issue of September 28, 1919. I am the person whose back is turned toward the said policeman and shown in the foreground with my hands in my pockets and in the act of walking away.)

I and my friend then entered his place of business, and a few minutes afterwards I looked out on the street over the summer doors. The policeman immediately charged me, and, being unable to enter the place of business on horseback, dismounted and entered into said place of business on foot.

I, being frightened because of what happened to my friend, retired to a room in the rear of said business. The policeman entered this room accompanied by another State policeman, and without cause, reason, or excuse struck me with his club and immediately thereafter arrested me. I was taken to the Homestead police station, and a forfeit of \$25 was taken for my appearance at a hearing that evening.

I appeared at the appointed time and place for my hearing before Burgess P. H. McGuire, of the above city. None of the aforesaid State policemen were present. The burgess asked me what was the reason for my arrest, and I replied, "I do not know. Ask my witness, Mr. Dressel, he may know." The burgess immediately replied, "We have no time to hear your witnesses," and immediately thereafter imposed a fine of \$10 and costs of prosecution upon me.

The sum of \$15.45 was deducted from my aforesaid \$25 forfeit.

I immediately requested a transcript from the said burgess and offered the usual fee for the same, and the burgess replied, "We have not time to write transcripts." I made similar demands on the said burgess on each of five or six consecutive days, and the identical reply was given each time. I was therefore compelled to engage counsel in order to protect my constitutional right, and my counsel after much delay and argument was finally granted the same. The said transcript, however, is not a true and correct record of the evidence submitted at this hearing. (The laws of this Commonwealth require an appellant on summary conviction to procure and enter his transcript in the proper appellate court within five days after judgment rendered.)

I am in no way interested in the present strike of the steel workers, but I do demand protection of my person. I am a citizen of the United States and have resided in Allegheny County for the past 29 years. I never was arrested and have always been considered a law-abiding, peaceful, and respected citizen of this community. I am also a freeholder in this county and have been for the past four years.

ADOLPH KUEHNEMUND.

Witnesses:

A. C. HEPP.

R. W. RILEY.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything further you wish to say?

Mr. BROWN. Only this, Senator, this is all I want to add, that we can not expect that organized labor is going to see that there is one law for the rich and for the men employing the workmen and another law for the workmen. This is going to arouse them, and it is arousing them, and last night they held perhaps the biggest meeting the central labor council has held in a long time in the city of Pittsburgh, and that meeting called upon the officials of the State Federation of Labor to call the labor organizations of the entire State of Pennsylvania into extraordinary session to see what might be done to stop this terrorizing on the part of the officials of organized labor in western Pennsylvania, and it seems to me that a great danger is developing here, and the men whose forefathers fought in the Revolutionary War, as mine did and as yours did, those men are not going to see their rights taken away from them, if there is available means by which they can prevent that and protect themselves against these things.

Senator STERLING. You speak about those whose forefathers fought in the Revolutionary War, and you call my attention to one thing. Now, I ask this question in all candidness and fairness. Is not the



great body of the strikers here now composed of other men than those whose claim is that their forefathers were the kind that you have described who fought in the Revolutionary War? Are they not, for the most part, foreign? Are not they the men who have been persuaded into this strike, and are not they the men who have been most depended upon in holding these meetings to join this strike, which you had previously contemplated, and for which you carried on this campaign? And, further, and part of the same question, are not the descendants of the men who fought in the Revolutionary War the men who are staying by and not complaining of the conditions in the mills?

Mr. BROWN. Well, Senator, that is quite a big question, and it can be answered yes or no. I will say, in answer to the first part of the question, whether the majority are foreigners, I will say yes. As to the Americans staying in the mills, I will say in some places that is true and in some places it is not. Let me qualify that a little further. The American Federation of Labor organizes men as they find them. The American Federation of Labor did not put the foreigners into the mills, but they found them there and, carrying on their general program of bettering the condition of the workers, they take them as they find them. If they had been mostly Americans, they would have pursued the same policy. As to the American Federation of Labor urging them to go out on strike, they did not do it. The American Federation of Labor sought to settle the grievances through a conference with the heads of the steel company, and they failed in that, and then the men decided by their vote, and they were the deciding factors and not the officials of the American Federation of Labor.

Senator STERLING. I mean by that, and I want to be so distinctly understood, that I cast no slight or aspersions of any kind upon the foreigners, none of them, but is it not a fact that a great proportion of the foreigners, of the strikers now out on strike are unnaturalized and are not naturalized citizens of the United States?

Mr. BROWN. No; I would not think that. I will agree that there is a large percentage of them, but I think it would be very difficult for any of us to tell to what extent. I will say that practically every meeting we have held, we have urged the men who had not gotten out their papers to get them, and to do everything possible to become identified with the institutions of this country. I doubt if there has been a meeting held in this whole district where efforts have not been made—and perhaps these were selfish also, for the reason that we are anxious to get them naturalized so that they can vote, so that we can vote such men now holding office out of office, and put in office other men who have higher regards for American institutions, so that we have got a selfish reason for wanting these men to become American citizens, so that we can vote them.

Senator STERLING. So you think that the American citizens, native born or naturalized now, or who exercise their rights to become naturalized as soon as they can after they get here, are not capable of doing that, but that we must depend mostly in this country on getting foreigners naturalized at the earliest date possible in order that we may have reforms. Is that your idea?

Mr. BROWN. Well, we will be perfectly justified in this particular section of the country, where laws are absolutely ignored, where

rights are trampled under foot—I say that the people who put those kind of men into office have not exercised their franchise wisely.

Senator STERLING. But you would not apply that to all generally, all over the United States?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, no. I think that the United States Government generally is all right.

Mr. RUBIN. Will you explain how the people in Pennsylvania cross the line into Ohio in order to hold their meetings?

Mr. BROWN. In Farrell and Sharon they are very close to the Ohio line, and the public meetings are prohibited up there on the same pretext as here, but the strikers there every day or so march, for instance, in some cases from 6 to 10 miles, or a couple of miles, on an average, across into the State of Ohio, where some of the principles of democracy still function, and there they hold their meetings, and no disorder has occurred at any meeting that has ever been held there.

Senator McKELLAR. You say that you take exceptions to the actions of the officers of this county. Are any of those officers Democrats? I happen to be a Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN. Well, we find this—

Senator STERLING. Don't you think the Senator should be taken in under an exception?

Mr. BROWN. Well, they are all for the Steel Trust, no matter what else they are.

Senator McKELLAR. My question was, are any of them Democrats?

Mr. BROWN. Well, I could not tell you. I have only met them as public officials, and I have found them against labor invariably. That is not true everywhere, because, now, for instance, out at Rankin we have never had a bit of trouble with the burgess, and in some of those points it is just the same; and the burgess lets us hold the meetings in Rankin; but the board of health won't. The burgess in Glassport will let us hold the meeting, but the sheriff won't. But there is some detail that prevents us from holding any meetings except in a very few places.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, I want to be entirely fair, and I want to say that I know of one Republican of yours who is a very fine Congressman, Congressman Moran.

Mr. BROWN. I will not dispute that; but there are some men in public office here whose business it is to see that labor is going up against a stacked deck all the while.

Mr. RUBIN. This special State convention which President Maher will be calling on the 6th of November next to take action against the police and other officials, state what other organizations have been invited to participate.

Mr. BROWN. All of the organizations that maintain fraternal relations with the State Federation of Labor, and that includes the Farmers' Grange and the more active still, the Railroad Brotherhoods. The Railroad Brotherhoods, I think, may be said to be deeply interested and as active in securing this State convention of the State Federation of Labor.

Senator McKELLAR. I am inclined very much to agree with you on this question of Americanizing these foreigners, but I call your attention to the fact that on yesterday, at Clairton, with which you seem to be familiar, I asked a crowd of perhaps 135 or 150 strikers

how many there were among them who were Americans and asked those who had become naturalized Americans to hold up their hands, and there were only three that held up their hands in all that crowd of men. That is a matter that should cause very careful concern, as to what we should do about those matters.

MR. BROWN. Should we not look at the cause? If you had asked those men how many of those men were in favor of American institutions you would have found all of the hands go up. But when they work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, and have to go through that performance and rigamarole that is somewhat involved and with which they are entirely unfamiliar, I think you will agree that it is something of a problem. Those men have to work every day of the year, and the judges on the bench do not work that long. Then can not go to work at 4 o'clock in the morning and get off at 5 o'clock at night and come in here to Pittsburgh—

Senator MCKELLAR. Well, while they are on the strike is a pretty good time for them to become Americans.

MR. BROWN. Yes; and the efforts of the organizers have been in that direction, and I think that you will find a very large percentage of those who have not got out their first papers have made an opportunity to do it, just as soon as this strike was on.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Brown, you know Mr. Foster, do you, very well?

MR. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know what his policies have been in the past? You do, do you not?

MR. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. So far as—

MR. BROWN. Yes; in the last—

Senator STERLING (interposing). You know that he was an I. W. W., if he is not now?

MR. BROWN. I know that he used to be.

Senator STERLING. There are a great many of the I. W. W.'s out on the western coast, aren't there?

MR. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Were you in any way affiliated with the I. W. W. organization?

MR. BROWN. No; I never was.

Senator STERLING. I believe you said that it was supporting business out on the western coast, the nonunion men can not work in the unionized district?

MR. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That is true?

MR. BROWN. No; not in the district but in the plant, but there was other places where the union men can not work.

Senator STERLING. Were there places where the union men can not work?

MR. BROWN. Yes, sir; Wright's shipyard at Tacoma, for instance, would not—let us see—Tacoma Shipbuilding Co., I believe it was. I would not be positive, but there was a big plant where they would not let—would not employ the union men at all.

Senator PHIPPS. You referred to the men working every day in the year. The testimony given this committee by some witnesses

has been to the effect that while men do work on Sunday, the work is carried out that they worked on when they quit on Sunday, when they do not get a Sunday off, they get one other day of the week in place of Sunday. You are testifying that you are yourself not thoroughly familiar with mill conditions. I call your attention to that system, because I think that you have been misinformed. According to the testimony of these witnesses, that system has been inaugurated.

Mr. BROWN. Well, that is my impression, and I will agree that possibly I may be mistaken, but my impression is that most of these jobs where the foreigners work, the common laborers and helpers, that most of them do work seven days a week. I may be entirely wrong on that, but I think that the six-day places are for the higher skilled positions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything more, Mr. Brown?

Senator WALSH. I want to ask one more question: Is it not your opinion, as a labor organizer, that Bolshevism, I. W. W.'sm, and Socialism and all other un-American methods are promulgated, increased, and developed greatly through the belief among the laboring men that unjust laws are passed and that public officials of all political parties do not give them a square deal?

Mr. BROWN. Well, that is the effect where that belief exists.

Senator WALSH. Then you do not consider it to be the duty of public officials to try to remove that undercurrent of feeling, and for men like you in the labor movement when you meet fair and square conditions on the part of the public officials, to emphasize that among the laboring men, and to point out to them that the laws are fair?

Mr. BROWN. We do exactly that thing.

Senator WALSH. Do you agree with me, as I have some very strong convictions about this—that the thing that is causing more unrest, and causing the growth of Bolshevism is the feeling—I do not say that it is true, that such is the fact—that they do not get a square deal, that the whole thing is a frame-up to their disadvantage? Is that true?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; Senator.

Senator WALSH. Is that the basis of all the Bolshevism and I. W. W. doctrine? I do not say that it is the fact, but is not that the thing which influences them most to become un-American—

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; and that will apply to Americans as well as foreigners. In this particular district, Senator, whether it is true or not, there is a popular belief among the workmen in the mill districts that the long arm of the Steel Trust heads off anything that may be undertaken to be done for the improvement of the conditions. And I say that that is an unhealthy condition, Senator. Take McKeesport, for instance—

Senator WALSH (interposing). Of course, men like you have a very great responsibility, as well as the rest of us, in that respect. If the conditions are fair and if the employers are fair, as you must find some of them are, and if conditions are fair and just—

Mr. BROWN (interposing). The hope was held out to these men and the belief was held out to these men that this movement would not result in a strike. All through this controversy—

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). Then why did not—why was not the strike postponed when the President of the United States wrote to you gentlemen, either directly or indirectly, through Mr. Gompers, asking you to postpone it in the hope that a conference between capital and labor now going on in Washington might arrange the matter amicably for every one? I say, why was it that you gentlemen insisted on the strike?

Mr. BROWN. We did not insist upon the strike.

Senator McKELLAR. But Mr. Gompers recommended it to you?

Mr. BROWN. I think you are mistaken.

Senator McKELLAR. To the 24 brotherhoods—I mean the 24 international organizations turned down the request of the President of the United States which was proffered to them in the hope that they might get together. Why did you do it?

Mr. BROWN. Well, Senator, that involves a little explanation.

Mark this: That in June, at the Atlantic City convention, this matter was taken up by these representatives of the 24 international organizations and President Gompers was directed to write a letter to Judge Gary and everybody was told to wait until we got this answer from the judge. We waited a month for the answer that never came. At the end of the month they said that they could not expect any answer and they held another meeting. Then they said, "Now, let us prove that we are speaking for the men," and they presented these four propositions to the men to be voted upon. That in a general way was regarded as directions that in the event they secured a conference they would make such conditions for these demands as they were able to.

Then the personal committee was appointed to see Judge Gary, and it was further stipulated that if they did not get a conference with Judge Gary that they should call a strike within 10 days, which would have made it about September 1. They did not secure a conference, and at the request of the President, they held it off, pending his efforts to bring about a conference, and the thing was kept postponed for a number of times, until finally the men in some places already went on strike. You heard one man testify here that up in Butler they went out on strike on August 6. That feeling was everywhere, that if they did not get a conference, and have something to tell the men, some definite achievement, that the thing would go along until cold weather set in, and the opportunities of securing the advantages would be greatly removed. The feeling was general on the part of the organization that if this strike was not called under the direction of the organizations, and thereby some discipline maintained, that it would be called here and there in a spasmodic fashion and the whole effort would be dissipated.

Senator McKELLAR. Then it was the organizers that turned down the request of the President for postponement. It was not the men.

Mr. BROWN. No; you are mistaken. They wired to President Wilson, asking for a further conference, if he had made any headway toward securing a conference. The President wired back to the general effect that he had not been able to do that, and then a meeting was held and the strike was agreed upon. Then the next day or some future time, President Gompers got a telegram from President Wilson, asking if this strike might not be postponed until

after the round table conference. President Gompers wrote a letter to another meeting that was held here in Pittsburgh of the national committee, in which he said that "if, without injury to your cause or to the men involved, you can postpone or comply with the President's request, I wish you would."

The men felt that they could not do that. They could not postpone it without injury to the men or the cause.

Senator McKELLAR. And when you say "men" do you mean the organizers?

Mr. BROWN. No; I mean the men in the mills.

Senator McKELLAR. Let me call your attention to this fact: This committee is undertaking to get at the truth about this whole matter, the living truth, as we understand it. We have no axes of any kind to grind. Yesterday certain members of the committee interviewed quite a body of strikers at Clairton, and I was convinced—I do not know how it struck the other members—but I was convinced that those men were exceedingly reasonable, and that a man like you could have gone to those men and said to them, "Here is the President of the United States, the man who is responsible for law and order in our country, the man who is responsible for fair and square dealing in our country, the man who is the Chief Executive of our land with all of the responsibility, and he has asked us to postpone this matter until he can call the representatives of labor together, and the representatives of capital together, to get this matter adjusted to the benefit of all.

A man like you, with your method of talking, could have told that party of men that we saw yesterday afternoon that fact, could have put that matter before them, and they would unanimously have approved it; that is, if I know men at all. The organizers did not tell the men that, did they?

Mr. BROWN. I will agree that that could have been done, Senator, but a man like me could not have told that to the men in McKeesport, nor in Duquesne, when we could not hold a public meeting. We can not hold a public meeting now to tell the men to go back to work or anything. A man like me or you could not hold a meeting in Duquesne, if you were a labor representative, or at McKeesport; and I will agree that the men in Clairton might very likely—it is very likely that they could have been told that, but we were under very great handicaps.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think it requires—don't you gentlemen who organize these men, and especially these foreigners, so many of them can not speak our language and so many of them are not amenable to our country's citizenship, don't you think that you are taking a great responsibility to advise those men to go out on the strike under those circumstances? Here was the President of the United States, to whom we all owe the highest respect and consideration at all times, and when he was asking, and asking in the interest of the whole people, not of any class, but of the whole people, that the matter be deferred simply until the big men representing all classes and all organizations of men in our country could be got together to devise ways and means of settling this very thing—

Mr. BROWN. I should say, Senator, that is the whole thing. Everybody looks at that from one side—

Senator McKELLAR (interrupting). I want to look at it from the side of the strikers.

Mr. BROWN. They were discharging men by the hundreds at McKeesport before this strike was called; there were a thousand men walking the streets, discharged, and now you say to labor "Wait." You do not say that to Judge Gary, and he was only one. He had 3,000 to talk to. Judge Gary could have done that—

Senator McKELLAR (interrupting). But when you say that, don't you come to this proposition, that we will pay more attention to Mr. Gary's silence than we will pay attention to the President of the United States, who has always been fair and just to us? In substance, is not that it?

Mr. BROWN. I presume I can say this, that the President of the United States stands very high in the minds of the men of labor because of the restrictions that he has removed to their proper functioning. Labor does not want any of the best of it. Labor just wants an opportunity to function. Labor has, especially in this case, as in all cases, we have met the other side, while the other side has not met us. Did anybody you mention, the President or anybody else, give us one particle or one thing, one peg upon which we could pin a hope that any postponement would bring about any such settlement? If we had gotten one thing upon which we could have pinned a hope that a settlement would have come, we would have—

Senator McKELLAR (interrupting). But let me suggest, here is the President of the United States, who has been exceedingly fair to you, and he makes a request that is not an unusual request, it does not ask you to give up anything except a postponement, until some kind of conciliation or arrangement or adjustment can be made, so that your rights may be protected, and yet you turn down your friend, you turn down the President, you gentlemen, who are organizing these unions, turn down the man who stood by you, apparently in order to get even with the man who has been opposed to you.

Mr. BROWN. I think that you are mistaken, Senator. Here is our position, and I wish you would try to see this. The President tells in his communication that he had exerted himself to get that conference, to secure a conference with Judge Gary. We had to draw this conclusion, that if the President of the United States, in making a personal appeal to Judge Gary, could not get anything at all, this round-table conference that represents even less dignity, authority, and power, will probably fail also, and so I say we were confronted with a proposition that was absolutely without hope.

Senator STERLING. Suppose, Mr. Brown, that you had represented to the authorities in these several places that you wanted to hold meetings, that you desired to hold meetings to pass upon the question in regard to the postponement of the strike; could not you have held meetings then? Could not you have held your meetings?

Mr. BROWN. I have no way of indicating that, and I am satisfied if we went and told them—no; I do not believe I would be justified in believing that, when the chief executive of the town tells me that Jesus Christ can not hold a meeting there, I have no reason for believing that under any conditions if I were to ask for a meeting that he would grant permission to hold it.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice that you speak in your answers to Senator McKellar of the two sides to this matter?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think that really there are three sides? Do you not recognize that there is an another side, the public, in all of these strikes, the great unorganized public of the country?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, absolutely; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So that it is not merely a question between the employer and the employee, where the interests of the country are tied up?

Mr. BROWN. Well, I was not speaking in a technical sense.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do recognize that the great public of the country has an interest in this matter?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, everybody has an interest. Society is so organized now so that practically every interest is affected to a greater or less extent.

The CHAIRMAN. And Senator Sterling asked you about your activities in the West.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think you said that you had no connection whatsoever with the I. W. W.

Mr. BROWN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you against them?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything to do—have you had anything to do—what was the occurrence out there in the West?

Mr. BROWN. The occurrence out in the West, at Everett? Do you mean at Everett?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. I was there.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you there at the time?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And had you anything to do with it one side or the other?

Mr. BROWN. No. That was an I. W. W. fight, Senator. That fight was not over an industrial question. It was over the right to hold meetings on a particular corner. They had been forbidden the right or the permission, or whatever we might term it, to hold meetings on a certain corner in the city of Everett, and a number of their men who had tried to hold meetings there had been beaten up and badly mistreated.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you in Everett at that time?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I was there that day.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you see this trouble?

Mr. BROWN. No. I did not see the trouble. I did not get there until late at night.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you in the Government service at that time?

Mr. BROWN. No; I was president of the International Timber Workers' Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything more?

Mr. RUBIN. Just carrying out the suggestion of Senator Walsh: In spite of the abuses by the officials, will you state what speakers say to the men about being patient, to love the institutions of the country, to revere the flag, and to be patient and hopeful.

Mr. BROWN. Absolutely at every one of the meetings we are permitted to hold, our men urge these people to be peaceful and law-abiding and to hold out to them the hope, and upon this meeting



here to-day and during the past week, the hopes of the workmen are hanging. They believe that you men are going to help to bring about a measure of justice long denied to them here in western Pennsylvania, and we have held out that hope, expressing to them the belief that injustice, once it becomes generally known, can not long endure in America.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further, Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. No; I think that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. BROWN. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

### TESTIMONY OF ISAAC M. SCOTT.

(Isaac M. Scott was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. SCOTT. I am president of the Wheeling Steel & Iron Co.

The CHAIRMAN. And your home is in Wheeling?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is the Wheeling Steel & Iron Co.?

Mr. SCOTT. It is a steel-manufacturing concern. We have blast furnaces, steel plants, tin-plate plants, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men do you employ?

Mr. SCOTT. Between 4,500 and 5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of them are out on the strike?

Mr. SCOTT. All of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The plant is closed down, is it?

Mr. SCOTT. The plant is closed down; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did that occur?

Mr. SCOTT. The plant was closed on the 22d of September, all but the tin-plate plant, and the tin-plate plant was closed on Thursday afternoon of this week.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you any agreement with the Amalgamated Association?

Mr. SCOTT. We have a contract with the Amalgamated Association, the Western Tin Plate Workers, expiring June 30 next, covering the tin-plate plant.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by that?

Mr. SCOTT. It is the regular agreement entered into yearly with those manufacturers working with them.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you enter into that?

Mr. SCOTT. In June last.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you employ only union men in your shop?

Mr. SCOTT. In that tin-plate plant, that is true, but in the other plants we have the open shop.

Senator McKELLAR. And does it cover all plants?

Mr. SCOTT. The agreement?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. No; only the tin-plate plant.

The CHAIRMAN. And is the tin-plate plant closed?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir. It was closed on September 22.

The CHAIRMAN. It was closed on September 22?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And did the tin-plate shopmen go out on September 22?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you expected them to go out at that time?

Mr. SCOTT. We had not any real reason to expect it, but we feared that would be the case, and we had a conference with the representatives of the Amalgamated Association on the Saturday before the Monday they went out.

The CHAIRMAN. And who were those representatives?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Tack was the head of the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any written proposal at that time?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; we had a written proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us a copy of that contract?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; we can give you a copy of the contract and this proposal which we received three days before that strike. Here, Mr. Chairman, is a copy of the contract.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be inserted in the record.

(The contract above referred to is here printed in full, as follows:)

WESTERN SCALES OF PRICES GOVERNING WAGES IN ROLLING MILLS FOR THE YEAR  
ENDING JUNE 30 1920.

Published by National Lodge, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America. General office, House Building, corner Smithfield and Water Streets, Pittsburg, Pa.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.

We, -----, of the first part, and ----- Lodge, No. -----, State of -----, National Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, of the second part, do hereby agree that the following scale of prices, based upon the actual scales and shipments of iron or steel, as arranged for in conferences, shall govern the wages of the several departments as herein stated, commencing July 1, 1919, and ending June 30, 1920.

It is agreed that when a scale or scales are signed in general or local conferences, said scales or contracts shall be considered inviolate for that scale year, and should the employees of any departments (who do not come under the above-named scales or contracts) become members of the Amalgamated Association during the said scale year, the Amalgamated Association may present a scale of wages covering said employees, but in case men and management can not come to an agreement on said scale, same shall be held over until the next general or local conference, and all men shall continue work until the expiration of the scale year.

However, should any of said employees be discharged for joining the Amalgamated Association, or for practicing legitimate union activities, said discharges shall be considered a grievance of the whole, in accordance with section 2 of memorandum of agreement.

It is further agreed that where local scales affecting other departments are under consideration and negotiation, all men will continue work until a settlement has been reached, or negotiations formally discontinued, unless it shall be apparent that there is intentional delay in settlements.

It is further agreed that no scale shall go below the base price named on the rate selected.

1. Whenever deviations from the western iron scale signed for by any manufacturer and the Amalgamated Association are made, and evidence is produced to prove it, the Amalgamated Association and manufacturers agree to make every effort to correct the same, provided the trains and furnaces are similar; but if the deviations continue to be tolerated by the Amalgamated Association all other mills shall receive the same. All manufacturers and workmen governed by this scale hereby agree not to make any deviations from the scale agreed to.

2. In case of a grievance arising at any mill, there shall be no cessation of work by men until same has been investigated through the proper channels, and has been finally passed upon by the district executive committee of the Amalgamated Association.

3. All men under the jurisdiction of the Amalgamated Association shall be paid out of the office, provided full data be furnished the company as to details. The Carnahan Sheet & Tin Plate Co. system of pay days to be in effect, except where pre ent semimonthly system is mutually satisfactory. This not to apply where straight two weeks or weekly pays now prevail.

For the company:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

For the lodge:

*Bar iron—Boiling.*

Based on actual sales of bar iron as per conference agreement.	Boiling per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Based on actual sales of bar iron as per conference agreement.	Boiling per ton of 2,240 pounds.
1 cent.....	\$5.70	2.55 cents.....	\$12.62
1.06 cents.....	5.60	2.60 cents.....	12.88
1.10 cents.....	5.70	2.65 cents.....	13.12
1.15 cents.....	5.80	2.70 cents.....	13.88
1.20 cents.....	5.90	2.75 cents.....	13.62
1.25 cents.....	6.00	2.80 cents.....	13.88
1.30 cents.....	6.83	2.85 cents.....	14.12
1.35 cents.....	7.02	2.90 cents.....	14.38
1.40 cents.....	7.23	2.95 cents.....	14.62
1.45 cents.....	7.42	3 cents.....	14.88
1.50 cents.....	7.63	3.05 cents.....	15.12
1.55 cents.....	7.82	3.10 cents.....	15.38
1.60 cents.....	8.03	3.15 cents.....	15.62
1.65 cents.....	8.22	3.20 cents.....	15.88
1.70 cents.....	8.43	3.25 cents.....	16.12
1.75 cents.....	8.62	3.30 cents.....	16.38
1.80 cents.....	8.88	3.35 cents.....	16.62
1.85 cents.....	9.12	3.40 cents.....	16.88
1.90 cents.....	9.38	3.45 cents.....	17.12
1.95 cents.....	9.62	3.50 cents.....	17.38
2 cents.....	9.88	3.55 cents.....	17.62
2.05 cents.....	10.12	3.60 cents.....	17.88
2.10 cents.....	10.38	3.65 cents.....	18.12
2.15 cents.....	10.62	3.70 cents.....	18.38
2.20 cents.....	10.88	3.75 cents.....	18.62
2.25 cents.....	11.12	3.80 cents.....	18.88
2.30 cents.....	11.38	3.85 cents.....	19.12
2.35 cents.....	11.62	3.90 cents.....	19.38
2.40 cents.....	11.88	3.95 cents.....	19.62
2.45 cents.....	12.12	4 cents.....	19.88
2.50 cents.....	12.38		

1. The charge for boiling furnaces shall be as follows: Single furnace, not more than 550 pounds per heat; double furnaces, not more than 1,100 pounds per heat; Siemen's furnaces, not more than 1,550 pounds per heat; double double furnaces, not more than 2,200 pounds per heat; and it is understood that two weeks' work shall be averaged.

2. The limit of time for each heat shall be as follows: For a single furnace, 1 hour and 45 minutes; for double furnaces, 1 hour and 50 minutes; for Siemen's furnace, 1 hour and 55 minutes; but no heats shall be charged after 8 hours from the regular charging time. When a majority of the furnaces in any mill require more than the time specified to make their heats, due notice shall be given to the management, in accordance with clause 2 of the memorandum of agreement. By the word majority is meant a majority of the furnaces working hard iron. Inferior coal, which increases the working time beyond that specified above, shall be considered a grievance.

3. One dollar per ton extra for dephosphorized iron, payment to be made for amount charged.

4. When 50 per cent, or more bessemer, or 50 per cent or more charcoal or iron of similar analysis is worked alone or mixed, \$1 per ton extra shall be paid.

5. One dollar per ton extra for all castings and runners over 75 pounds in one piece, and for all scrap pig metal 25 pounds and under, when worked alone. All clean castings, 75 pounds and under, when worked alone or with less than 50 per cent of pig metal, 50 cents per ton extra shall be paid.

6. One dollar per ton extra for hot ore fix.

7. Fifty cents per ton extra for all metal bolled, also for fomented swarth or malleable iron worked on clay or hot cinder fix or sand.

8. Boilers shall be paid for all blooms and sliders equivalent to 490 pounds where the charge is 500 pounds per heat and 535 when the charge is 550 pounds, and 1,070 pounds when the charge is 1,100 in a double furnace, when it is no fault of the boiler.

9. Pot metal or stove plate worked alone, or mixed 50 cents per ton extra shall be paid, but if stove plate or pot metal to the extent of 100 pounds or less is worked with pig metal, no extra charge shall be paid.

10. Six heats shall constitute a day's work on single, and five heats on double and three-turn systems. On mills working single turn, five heats shall constitute a day's work on Saturday.

11. No double furnace shall be allowed to work without four men.

12. Puddlers when boiling metal shall only lose the amount over the limit of a ball, and where companies do not weigh, or neglect to weigh in all material before charging, men shall not lose overweight on heavy balls.

13. In case of shutdown in muck mill where it is no fault of the crew, 45 minutes shall be the time to wait after two furnaces are ready, and if company wants the men to stay longer in case of stoppage, that company pay the average output of the time after 45 minutes, and that company pay for heats thrown out. If a mill is shut down at the end of turn, the combined waiting time of the outgoing and incoming crews shall not exceed 45 minutes.

14. All swath used as a mixture, with metal or cobbles, shall be paid for at the price governing the metal.

15. The company shall put water shields on all furnaces in puddle mills.

16. The company shall furnish tap buggies for puddler.

17. When malleable iron grindings are worked in a boiling furnace alone, or when mixed with other material, the price paid for boiling shall prevail.

18. The company shall do all necessary fixing, including the cutting of grates, hanging of doors, and all new brick work on bridges. This shall not be construed to apply to the usual fixing between turns and heats.

19. When a boiling furnace is new or new bottom plates are installed, the boiler who makes the bottom shall be paid an average heat for same.

20. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 a. m. on the first turn of the week.

*Bar iron—Busheling on cinder bottom.*

Based on actual sales of bar iron as per conference agreement. Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Heavy scrap.	Light scrap or turnings.	Cast borings.	Based on actual sales of bar iron as per conference agreement. Per ton of 2,240 pounds.	Heavy scrap.	Light scrap or turnings.	Cast borings.
1 cent.....	\$2.38	\$2.97	\$4.50	2.55 cents.....	\$5.82	\$7.28	\$10.73
1.05 cents.....	2.32	3.03	4.50	2.60 cents.....	5.94	7.43	10.95
1.10 cents.....	2.38	3.10	4.625	2.65 cents.....	6.06	7.58	11.17
1.15 cents.....	2.44	3.17	4.75	2.70 cents.....	6.19	7.73	11.38
1.20 cents.....	2.51	3.26	4.875	2.75 cents.....	6.31	7.88	11.60
1.25 cents.....	2.58	3.35	5.00	2.80 cents.....	6.43	8.03	11.82
1.30 cents.....	2.65	3.81	5.69	2.85 cents.....	6.56	8.18	12.03
1.35 cents.....	3.05	3.93	5.87	2.90 cents.....	6.68	8.33	12.25
1.40 cents.....	3.16	4.05	6.04	2.95 cents.....	6.80	8.48	12.47
1.45 cents.....	3.25	4.17	6.22	3 cents.....	6.93	8.63	12.68
1.50 cents.....	3.35	4.29	6.39	3.05 cents.....	7.05	8.78	12.90
1.55 cents.....	3.45	4.41	6.57	3.10 cents.....	7.17	8.93	13.12
1.60 cents.....	3.55	4.53	6.74	3.15 cents.....	7.30	9.08	13.33
1.65 cents.....	3.65	4.65	6.92	3.20 cents.....	7.42	9.23	13.55
1.70 cents.....	3.75	4.77	7.09	3.25 cents.....	7.54	9.38	13.77
1.75 cents.....	3.85	4.89	7.27	3.30 cents.....	7.67	9.53	13.98
1.80 cents.....	3.97	5.04	7.48	3.35 cents.....	7.79	9.68	14.20
1.85 cents.....	4.22	5.33	7.91	3.40 cents.....	7.91	9.83	14.42
1.90 cents.....	4.09	5.18	7.70	3.45 cents.....	8.04	9.98	14.63
1.95 cents.....	4.34	5.48	8.13	3.50 cents.....	8.16	10.13	14.85
2 cents.....	4.46	5.63	8.35	3.55 cents.....	8.28	10.28	15.07
2.05 cents.....	4.58	5.78	8.57	3.60 cents.....	8.41	10.43	15.28
2.10 cents.....	4.71	5.93	8.78	3.65 cents.....	8.53	10.58	15.50
2.15 cents.....	4.83	6.08	9.00	3.70 cents.....	8.65	10.73	15.72
2.20 cents.....	4.95	6.23	9.22	3.75 cents.....	8.78	10.88	15.93
2.25 cents.....	5.08	6.38	9.43	3.80 cents.....	8.90	11.03	16.15
2.30 cents.....	5.20	6.53	9.65	3.85 cents.....	9.02	11.18	16.37
2.35 cents.....	5.32	6.68	9.87	3.90 cents.....	9.15	11.33	16.58
2.40 cents.....	5.45	6.83	10.08	3.95 cents.....	9.27	11.48	16.80
2.45 cents.....	5.67	6.98	10.30	4 cents.....	9.39	11.63	17.02
2.50 cents.....	5.69	7.13	10.52				

1. When swarth is worked alone, company shall furnish scrap for starters.
2. When the company insists that swarth worked alone shall be fomented, boiling price shall be paid.
3. Busheling one-third wrought-iron turnings and two-thirds heavy scrap on cinder bottom, to be heavy-scrap price.
4. Fifty cents per ton extra for all metal boiled, also for fomented swarth or malleable iron worked on clay or hot cinder fix or sand.
5. All mills where screenings from squeezers or rolls are given to puddlers when working swarth, that the full swarth price be paid and that such screenings can not be classed as mixed material.
6. Light scrap or turnings price shall apply on the following materials: Wrought turnings or nut trimmings, sheets and hoop No. 19 and lighter, wire No. 5 and lighter. Light scrap to be cut 10 inches or less in length.
7. Light-scrap price to be paid when light-scrap bundles are charged not heavier than 40 pounds each, and not exceeding 18 inches in length. When over 40 pounds each, 25 cents extra to be paid on the total tonnage of bundles used. Total bundles not to exceed 80 pounds to each ball.
8. When either light or heavy scrap is worked without turnings, 20 cents extra above regular price shall be paid, this not to apply for the first 48 hours if turnings are not in stock, and that the 48 hours only apply once every 30 days.
9. Pipe scrap over 4 inches in diameter, and heavy boiler plate shall be cut from 4 to 6 inches in length; all pipe scrap, 6 inches and over in diameter, to be cut diagonally or flattened before charging.
10. All heavy scrap for busheling to be cut 8 inches or less in length before charging.
11. That where pipe is worked in cinder-bottom furnaces, mixed with light scrap, it shall be cut 4 to 6 inches long for charging.
12. All material shall be placed within 10 feet of charging door.
14. Where the company insists upon working scrap balls, weighing over 400 pounds, extra help shall be furnished and paid for by the firm.
15. When mixed material is worked, which is not provided for by the scale, the mean price between the prices of the material used shall be paid, the proportion not to go below one-third; this not to apply when worked with metal.
16. In case of shutdown in muck mill, where it is no fault of the crew, 45 minutes shall be the time to wait after two furnaces are ready, and if company wants men to stay longer, in case of stoppage, that company pay the average output for the time after the 45 minutes, and that company pay for heats thrown out. If a mill is shut down at the end of turn, the combined waiting time of the outgoing and incoming crews shall not exceed 45 minutes.
17. All swarth used as a mixture, with metal or cobbles, shall be paid for at the price governing the metal.
18. The company shall put water shields on all furnaces in puddle mills.
19. The company shall furnish tap buggies for the puddler.
20. Scrappers shall lose only the amount over the limit of a ball.
21. No doubled furnace shall be allowed to work without four men.
22. The time on cinder-bottom furnaces shall in no case exceed eight hours, from the regular time the mill begins to roll, until the first furnace commences to charge the last heat. But when the first heat is straight swarth or metal, the time on cinder-bottom furnaces shall in no case exceed eight hours from the regular time the mill begins to roll until the first furnace commences to charge the last heat, and no cinder-bottom furnaces shall charge after seven hours on Saturday or days preceding Christmas and Fourth of July. All cinder-bottom furnaces to have a regular time for charging. This not to apply to mills working shorter charging hours.
23. When malleable iron grindings are worked in a cinder-bottom busheling furnace alone, or when mixed with other material, the price paid for boiling shall prevail.
24. The company shall do all necessary fixing, including the cutting of grates, hanging of doors, and all new brickwork on bridges. This shall not be construed to apply to the usual fixing between turns and heats.
25. Where the scrap is not weighed in, and the company has a limit on a ball, the weight of the balls shall be averaged at the end of the turn to the company limit.
25. Where the scrap is not weighed in and the company has a limit on a ball the weight of the balls shall be averaged at the end of the turn, to the company limit.

26. All iron taken from the bottom of furnaces using sand for the bottom and worked on cinder-bottom furnaces to be paid at boiling price.

27. Busheler shall be paid for all blooms and sliders when it is no fault of the busheler.

28. All muck or scrap bar worked alone on cinder-bottom furnaces shall be paid for at one-half price of boiling.

29. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 a. m. on the first turn of the week.

*Bar iron—Busheling on sand bottom.*

Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement. Per ton of 2,200 pounds.	Heavy scrap.	Light scrap.	Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement. Per ton of 2,200 pounds.	Heavy scrap.	Light scrap.
1 cent.....	\$2.025	\$2.28	2.55 cents.....	\$1.377	\$5.82
1.05 cents.....	2.05	2.32	2.60 cents.....	4.457	5.94
1.10 cents.....	2.075	2.38	2.65 cents.....	4.537	6.06
1.15 cents.....	2.10	2.44	2.70 cents.....	4.627	6.19
1.20 cents.....	2.13	2.51	2.75 cents.....	4.707	6.31
1.25 cents.....	2.17	2.58	2.80 cents.....	4.787	6.43
1.30 cents.....	2.457	2.85	2.85 cents.....	4.877	6.56
1.35 cents.....	2.527	3.05	2.90 cents.....	4.957	6.68
1.40 cents.....	2.587	3.15	2.95 cents.....	5.037	6.80
1.45 cents.....	2.657	3.25	3 cents.....	5.127	6.93
1.50 cents.....	2.717	3.35	3.05 cents.....	5.207	7.05
1.55 cents.....	2.787	3.45	3.10 cents.....	5.287	7.17
1.60 cents.....	2.747	3.55	3.15 cents.....	5.377	7.30
1.65 cents.....	2.917	3.65	3.20 cents.....	5.457	7.42
1.70 cents.....	2.977	3.75	3.25 cents.....	5.537	7.54
1.75 cents.....	3.017	3.85	3.30 cents.....	5.627	7.67
1.80 cents.....	3.127	3.97	3.35 cents.....	5.707	7.79
1.85 cents.....	3.207	4.09	3.40 cents.....	5.787	7.91
1.90 cents.....	3.287	4.22	3.45 cents.....	5.877	8.04
1.95 cents.....	3.367	4.34	3.50 cents.....	5.957	8.16
2 cents.....	3.457	4.46	3.55 cents.....	6.037	8.28
2.05 cents.....	3.537	4.58	3.60 cents.....	6.127	8.41
2.10 cents.....	3.627	4.71	3.65 cents.....	6.207	8.53
2.15 cents.....	3.707	4.83	3.70 cents.....	6.287	8.65
2.20 cents.....	3.787	4.95	3.75 cents.....	6.377	8.78
2.25 cents.....	3.877	5.08	3.80 cents.....	6.457	8.90
2.30 cents.....	3.957	5.20	3.85 cents.....	6.537	9.02
2.35 cents.....	4.037	5.32	3.90 cents.....	6.627	9.15
2.40 cents.....	4.127	5.45	3.95 cents.....	6.707	9.27
2.45 cents.....	4.207	5.57	4 cents.....	6.787	9.39
2.50 cents.....	4.287	5.69			

1. Busheling heavy scrap and not more than one-third wrought-iron turnings, mixed on sand bottom, to be 10 cents per ton above the current price for busheling on sand bottom. This not to apply where 50 pounds of turnings or less is used to one ball.

2. Light scrap or turnings price shall apply on the following materials: Wrought turnings, or nut trimmings, sheets and hoops No. 19 and lighter, wire No. 5 and lighter, light scrap to be cut 10 inches or less in length.

3. Pipe scrap over 4 inches in diameter shall be cut from 4 to 6 inches in length, and all heavy scrap shall be cut not more than 8 inches in length before charging.

4. When mixed material is worked, which is not provided for by the scale, the mean price between the prices of the material used shall be paid. The proportion not to go below one-third.

5. Light scrap price to be paid when light scrap bundles are charged, not heavier than 40 pounds each and not exceeding 18 inches in length. When over 40 pounds each, 25 cents extra to be paid on the total tonnage of bundles used. Total bundles not to exceed 80 pounds to each ball.

6. When either light or heavy scrap is worked without turnings, 20 cents extra above regular price shall be paid, this not to apply for the first 48 hours if turnings are not in stock, and that the 48 hours only apply once every 30 days.

7. Scrappers shall lose only the amount over the limit of a ball.

8. All blooms and cobbles worked in a sand-bottom busheling furnace shall be paid for at the straight price for busheling heavy scrap.

9. When more than 10 per cent of each charge on sand-bottom furnaces is galvanized sheet or wire scrap, 50 cents per ton extra shall be paid.

10. In case of shutdown in muck mill, where it is no fault of the crew, 45 minutes shall be the time to wait after two furnaces are ready, and if company wants men to stay longer in case of stoppage that company pay the average output for the time after 45 minutes, and that company pay for heats thrown out. If a mill is shut down at the end of turn, the combined waiting time of the outgoing and incoming crews shall not exceed 45 minutes.

11. Busheler shall be paid for all blooms and slders when it is no fault of the busheler.

12. Where flat scales are adopted to overcome local difficulties in busheling mills, no such scales can be signed by any lodge belonging to this association that will conflict with the complete application of all clauses in the busheling scale from clause 6 to clause 13.

13. The company shall put water shields on all busheling furnaces, and all sand-bottom busheling furnaces shall be equipped with chargers where practical.

14. The company shall do all necessary fixing, including the cutting of grates, hanging of doors, and all new brickwork on bridges. This shall not be construed to apply to the usual fixing between turns and heats.

15. No sand-bottom furnaces shall charge after seven hours on Saturday or days preceding Christmas and Fourth of July. All sand-bottom furnaces to have a regular time for charging. This not to apply to mills now working shorter hours.

16. Where the scrap is not weighed in and the company has a limit on a ball the weight of the balls shall be averaged at the end of the turn to the company limit.

17. When punchings mixed with light scrap are worked on sand-bottom furnaces they shall be classed as light scrap.

18. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 a. m. on the first turn of the week.

*Muck or puddle mill, based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement, per ton of 2,240 pounds.*

Card rate.	Roller.	Roughing down.	Roughing up.	Catching.	Roughing hook.	Finishing hook.	Price for rolling on trains of two sets of rolls or less.
<b>BAR IRON.</b>							
1 cent.	\$0.287	\$0.091	\$0.091	\$0.087	\$0.054	\$0.052	\$0.665
1.05 cents	.294	.096	.093	.089	.055	.053	.680
1.10 cents	.301	.098	.095	.091	.056	.054	.696
1.15 cents	.310	.101	.098	.094	.057	.055	.715
1.20 cents	.317	.103	.100	.096	.058	.056	.730
1.25 cents	.324	.105	.102	.098	.059	.057	.745
1.30 cents	.366	.119	.115	.111	.067	.065	.844
1.35 cents	.376	.122	.118	.114	.069	.067	.867
1.40 cents	.386	.125	.121	.117	.071	.069	.89
1.45 cents	.396	.128	.124	.120	.073	.071	.913
1.50 cents	.406	.131	.127	.123	.075	.073	.936
1.55 cents	.416	.134	.130	.126	.077	.075	.959
1.60 cents	.426	.137	.133	.129	.079	.077	.982
1.65 cents	.436	.140	.136	.132	.081	.079	1.005
1.70 cents	.446	.143	.139	.135	.083	.081	1.028
1.75 cents	.456	.146	.143	.138	.085	.083	1.051
1.80 cents	.467	.150	.147	.142	.0875	.0855	1.081
1.85 cents	.482	.154	.151	.146	.090	.088	1.111
1.90 cents	.496	.158	.155	.150	.0925	.0905	1.141
1.95 cents	.508	.162	.159	.154	.095	.093	1.171
2 cents	.521	.166	.163	.158	.0975	.0955	1.201
2.05 cents	.534	.170	.167	.162	.1000	.098	1.231
2.10 cents	.547	.174	.171	.166	.1025	.1005	1.261
2.15 cents	.560	.178	.175	.170	.105	.103	1.291
2.20 cents	.573	.182	.179	.174	.1075	.1055	1.321
2.25 cents	.586	.186	.183	.178	.1100	.1080	1.351
2.30 cents	.599	.190	.187	.182	.1125	.1105	1.381
2.35 cents	.612	.194	.191	.186	.115	.1130	1.411
2.40 cents	.625	.198	.195	.190	.1175	.1155	1.441
2.45 cents	.638	.202	.199	.194	.120	.1180	1.471
2.50 cents	.651	.206	.203	.198	.1225	.1205	1.501
2.55 cents	.664	.210	.207	.202	.125	.1230	1.531
2.60 cents	.677	.214	.211	.206	.1275	.1255	1.561
2.65 cents	.690	.218	.215	.210	.130	.1280	1.591
2.70 cents	.703	.222	.219	.214	.1325	.1305	1.621
2.75 cents	.716	.226	.223	.218	.135	.133	1.651

*Muck or puddle mill, based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement, per ton of 2,240 pounds—Continued.*

Card rate.	Roller.	Roughing down.	Roughing up.	Catching.	Roughing hook.	Finishing hook.	Price for rolling on trains of two sets of rolls or less.
<b>BAR IRON—continued.</b>							
2.80 cents.....	\$0.729	\$0.230	\$0.227	\$0.222	\$0.1375	\$0.1355	\$1.681
2.85 cents.....	.742	.234	.231	.226	.140	.1380	1.711
2.90 cents.....	.755	.238	.235	.230	.1425	.1405	1.741
2.95 cents.....	.768	.242	.239	.234	.145	.143	1.771
3 cents.....	.781	.246	.243	.238	.1475	.1455	1.801
3.05 cents.....	.794	.250	.247	.242	.150	.148	1.831
3.10 cents.....	.807	.254	.251	.246	.1525	.1505	1.861
3.15 cents.....	.820	.258	.255	.250	.155	.153	1.891
3.20 cents.....	.833	.262	.259	.254	.1575	.1555	1.921
3.25 cents.....	.846	.266	.263	.258	.160	.158	1.951
3.30 cents.....	.859	.270	.267	.262	.1625	.1605	1.981
3.35 cents.....	.872	.274	.271	.266	.1650	.163	2.011
3.40 cents.....	.885	.278	.275	.270	.1675	.1655	2.041
3.45 cents.....	.898	.282	.279	.274	.170	.168	2.071
3.50 cents.....	.911	.286	.283	.278	.1725	.1705	2.101
3.55 cents.....	.924	.290	.287	.282	.175	.173	2.131
3.60 cents.....	.937	.294	.291	.286	.1775	.1755	2.161
3.65 cents.....	.950	.298	.295	.290	.180	.178	2.191
3.70 cents.....	.963	.302	.299	.294	.1825	.1805	2.221
3.75 cents.....	.976	.306	.303	.298	.185	.183	2.251
3.80 cents.....	.989	.310	.307	.302	.1875	.1855	2.281
3.85 cents.....	1.002	.314	.311	.306	.190	.188	2.311
3.90 cents.....	1.015	.318	.315	.310	.1925	.1905	2.341
3.95 cents.....	1.028	.322	.319	.314	.195	.193	2.371
4 cents.....	1.041	.326	.323	.318	.1975	.1955	2.401

1. The roller to pay all labor in taking iron from squeezer and delivering upon bank straightened, except bloom boy. In such case where a bloom boy is used the company shall pay one-half the wages paid to said bloom boy.

2. For doubling muck iron on two high muck mills the roller shall receive 17 cents per ton extra above scale prices. Same to be divided pro rata with roller and crew.

3. When billets 1½ inches or less are rolled on a two-high muck mill any extra help required by the roller shall be paid by the company.

4. In no case shall any deduction of weight be taken from the roller on account of overweight by the rollers. He shall be paid full weight for all iron that passes through the rolls.

5. On mills averaging 20 tons or less per turn in two weeks the company shall pay the drag outs.

6. For rolling billets on muck mill on sizes anything below 1½ inches the price shall be 17½ cents per ton extra. Same to be divided pro rata with roller and crew.

7. On muck or puddle mills on which three crews are employed three rollers shall also be employed.

8. In case of shutdown in muck mill (providing the stoppage is no fault of the men) 45 minutes shall be the time to wait for operations to be resumed from the time the next two furnaces are ready after stoppage occurs, and if the company wishes the men to stay after 45 minutes the company to pay men for the average work that would be turned out in additional time the men are waiting. If a mill is shut down at the end of turn, the combined waiting time of the outgoing and incoming crews shall not exceed 45 minutes.

9. That bulldogger on two-high muck mill rolls be paid same as rougher on same mill.

10. That night-turn rollers on muck mills shall receive not less than 85 per cent of the net earnings of his own turn.

11. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 a. m. on the first turn of the week.



*Bar iron—Piles on boards.*

Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement.	Heating, per ton 2,240 pounds.	Shingling per ton 2,240 pounds.	Run-downs.	Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement.	Heating, per ton 2,240 pounds.	Shingling per ton 2,240 pounds.	Run-downs.
1 cent.....	\$1.53	\$0.617	\$0.2575	2.55 cents.....	\$2.69	\$1.177	\$ .481
1.05 cents.....	1.545	.625	.26	2.60 cents.....	2.73	1.196	.490
1.10 cents.....	1.56	.632	.26	2.65 cents.....	2.77	1.215	.497
1.15 cents.....	1.575	.64	.265	2.70 cents.....	2.81	1.234	.506
1.20 cents.....	1.59	.647	.2675	2.75 cents.....	2.85	1.253	.514
1.25 cents.....	1.605	.655	.27	2.80 cents.....	2.89	1.272	.522
1.30 cents.....	1.795	.737	.302	2.85 cents.....	2.93	1.291	.531
1.35 cents.....	1.82	.751	.306	2.90 cents.....	2.97	1.301	.539
1.40 cents.....	1.845	.765	.309	2.95 cents.....	3.01	1.329	.547
1.45 cents.....	1.87	.779	.314	3 cents.....	3.05	1.348	.556
1.50 cents.....	1.90	.793	.319	3.05 cents.....	3.09	1.367	.564
1.55 cents.....	1.935	.807	.324	3.10 cents.....	3.13	1.386	.572
1.60 cents.....	1.96	.821	.329	3.15 cents.....	3.17	1.405	.581
1.65 cents.....	1.99	.835	.334	3.20 cents.....	3.21	1.424	.589
1.70 cents.....	2.02	.849	.339	3.25 cents.....	3.25	1.443	.597
1.75 cents.....	2.05	.863	.344	3.30 cents.....	3.29	1.462	.606
1.80 cents.....	2.09	.882	.346	3.35 cents.....	3.33	1.481	.614
1.85 cents.....	2.13	.901	.364	3.40 cents.....	3.37	1.50	.622
1.90 cents.....	2.17	.93	.369	3.45 cents.....	3.41	1.519	.631
1.95 cents.....	2.21	.949	.379	3.50 cents.....	3.45	1.538	.639
2 cents.....	2.25	.968	.389	3.55 cents.....	3.49	1.557	.647
2.05 cents.....	2.29	.987	.397	3.60 cents.....	3.53	1.576	.656
2.10 cents.....	2.33	1.006	.406	3.65 cents.....	3.57	1.596	.664
2.15 cents.....	2.37	1.025	.414	3.70 cents.....	3.61	1.614	.672
2.20 cents.....	2.41	1.044	.422	3.75 cents.....	3.65	1.633	.681
2.25 cents.....	2.45	1.063	.431	3.80 cents.....	3.69	1.652	.689
2.30 cents.....	2.49	1.082	.439	3.85 cents.....	3.73	1.671	.697
2.35 cents.....	2.53	1.101	.447	3.90 cents.....	3.77	1.691	.706
2.40 cents.....	2.57	1.112	.456	3.95 cents.....	3.81	1.709	.714
2.45 cents.....	2.61	1.139	.464	4 cents.....	3.85	1.728	.722
2.50 cents.....	2.65	1.158	.472				

1. The scrapper to find his own help and pile his own scrap.

2. Whenever the company desires to pile scrap and deliver same to furnace and help charge, 30 per cent below above prices shall be paid; wherever the company desires to furnish all help, including rundown, pilers, and chargers, the price shall be 50 per cent below base price as mentioned above. Heater to pay fireman and spell hands, company to pay rundown, pilers, and chargers.

3. Heating piles or blooms on sand bottoms shall be \$1.07 per ton, and advance and decline in same proportion as above scale.

4. In case of shutdown in muck mill where it is no fault of the crew 45 minutes shall be the time to wait after two furnaces are ready, and if company wants the men to stay longer in case of stoppage, that company pay the average output of the time after 45 minutes, and that company pay for heats thrown out. If a mill is shut down at the end of turn, the combined waiting time of the outgoing and incoming crews shall not exceed 45 minutes.

5. On mills working piles on boards exclusively, the roll hands shall receive not less than muck-mill prices.

6. When working piles on boards direct to the rolls, weighing 125 pounds or more, extra help shall be furnished to the heater, the same to be paid by the company. Said help shall also assist the rundown to charge.

7. Shingler's spell hand shall be paid not less than one-third and 5 per cent of shingler's price, to be paid by the shingler.

8. That when working on a pile weighing over 300 pounds the company shall furnish hooker for hammerman.

*Bar iron—Knobbling.*

Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement.	Scrap, per ton 2,240 pounds.	Refined iron, per ton 2,240 pounds.	Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement.	Scrap, per ton 2,240 pounds.	Refined iron, per ton 2,240 pounds.
1 cent. ....	\$4.281	\$5.581	2.55 cents. ....	\$7.366	\$9.375
1.05 cents. ....	4.327	5.640	2.60 cents. ....	7.471	9.503
1.10 cents. ....	4.372	5.689	2.65 cents. ....	7.576	9.630
1.15 cents. ....	4.418	5.758	2.70 cents. ....	7.680	9.757
1.20 cents. ....	4.463	5.818	2.75 cents. ....	7.785	9.884
1.25 cents. ....	4.509	5.877	2.80 cents. ....	7.889	10.012
1.30 cents. ....	5.039	6.562	2.85 cents. ....	7.994	10.139
1.35 cents. ....	5.112	6.648	2.90 cents. ....	8.098	10.266
1.40 cents. ....	5.185	6.735	2.95 cents. ....	8.203	10.393
1.45 cents. ....	5.258	6.821	3 cents. ....	8.307	10.521
1.50 cents. ....	5.330	6.907	3.05 cents. ....	8.412	10.648
1.55 cents. ....	5.403	6.994	3.10 cents. ....	8.516	10.775
1.60 cents. ....	5.476	7.080	3.15 cents. ....	8.621	10.902
1.65 cents. ....	5.548	7.166	3.20 cents. ....	8.725	11.030
1.70 cents. ....	5.621	7.253	3.25 cents. ....	8.830	11.157
1.75 cents. ....	5.694	7.339	3.30 cents. ....	8.935	11.284
1.80 cents. ....	5.798	7.466	3.35 cents. ....	9.039	11.412
1.85 cents. ....	5.903	7.594	3.40 cents. ....	9.144	11.539
1.90 cents. ....	6.007	7.721	3.45 cents. ....	9.248	11.666
1.95 cents. ....	6.112	7.848	3.50 cents. ....	9.353	11.793
2 cents. ....	6.217	7.975	3.55 cents. ....	9.457	11.921
2.05 cents. ....	6.331	8.103	3.60 cents. ....	9.562	12.048
2.10 cents. ....	6.426	8.230	3.65 cents. ....	9.666	12.175
2.15 cents. ....	6.530	8.357	3.70 cents. ....	9.771	12.302
2.20 cents. ....	6.636	8.485	3.75 cents. ....	9.875	12.430
2.25 cents. ....	6.739	8.612	3.80 cents. ....	9.980	12.557
2.30 cents. ....	6.844	8.739	3.85 cents. ....	10.094	12.684
2.35 cents. ....	6.948	8.866	3.90 cents. ....	10.098	12.811
2.40 cents. ....	7.053	8.994	3.95 cents. ....	10.294	12.939
2.45 cents. ....	7.157	9.121	4 cents. ....	10.398	12.066
2.50 cents. ....	7.257	9.248			

1. The price for knobbling raw pig iron shall be \$2 per ton above the price paid for knobbling refined iron.

2. Knobbler to pay his helper one-third the above price for refined iron and pig metal.

3. That all sheet-mill scrap be cut or bundled not to exceed 22 inches in length.

4. Where a limit has been placed on a ball, the charge must be weighed in; if not, knobbler must be paid for all he turns out.

5. When working all iron over 300 pounds, the company shall furnish hooker for hammerman, this to include knobbling iron.

6. When charcoal iron is hammered to gauge or roll size, 25 cents per ton (of 2,240 pounds) above the scale price for shingling shall be paid.

7. Company to deliver all material on knobbler's standing.

8. When hammer is more than 100 feet from knobbling furnace, company to furnish buggy man.

9. In case of shutdown in muck mill, where it is no fault of the crew, 45 minutes shall be the time to wait after two furnaces are ready; and if company wants the men to stay longer in case of stoppage, that company pay the average output of the time after 45 minutes, and that company pay for heats thrown out. If a mill is shut down at the end of turn, the combined waiting time of the outgoing and incoming crews shall not exceed 45 minutes.

10. Company shall do all the necessary repairing of brickwork and necessary pipe fitting, also keep the flues clean from ashes.

11. If squeezer is used, the knobbler shall be paid for all blooms and sliders, when it is no fault of the knobbler.

12. Knobbler to keep furnace in working condition, providing that company furnish him with necessary material.

*Bar iron—Heating slabs and shingling.*

Based on actual sales bar iron, as per conference agreement.	Shingling muck iron and rehammered iron, 2,240 pounds.	Shingling charcoal iron, 2,240 pounds.	Heating, also shingling slabs and doubling, 2,240 pounds.	Based on actual sales bar iron, as per conference agreement.	Shingling muck iron and rehammered iron, 2,240 pounds.	Shingling charcoal iron, 2,240 pounds.	Heating, also shingling slabs and doubling, 2,240 pounds.
1 cent.....	\$0.725	\$0.727	\$0.725	2.55 cents.....	\$1.305	\$1.265	\$1.305
1.05 cents.....	.732	.734	.732	2.60 cents.....	1.325	1.283	1.325
1.10 cents.....	.74	.741	.74	2.65 cents.....	1.345	1.302	1.345
1.15 cents.....	.747	.747	.747	2.70 cents.....	1.365	1.32	1.365
1.20 cents.....	.755	.754	.755	2.75 cents.....	1.385	1.338	1.385
1.25 cents.....	.762	.761	.762	2.80 cents.....	1.405	1.356	1.405
1.30 cents.....	.864	.86	.864	2.85 cents.....	1.425	1.374	1.425
1.35 cents.....	.873	.873	.873	2.90 cents.....	1.445	1.393	1.445
1.40 cents.....	.887	.885	.887	2.95 cents.....	1.465	1.411	1.465
1.45 cents.....	.901	.898	.901	3 cents.....	1.485	1.429	1.485
1.50 cents.....	.915	.911	.915	3.05 cents.....	1.505	1.447	1.505
1.55 cents.....	.929	.923	.929	3.10 cents.....	1.525	1.465	1.525
1.60 cents.....	.943	.936	.943	3.15 cents.....	1.545	1.483	1.545
1.65 cents.....	.957	.949	.957	3.20 cents.....	1.565	1.502	1.565
1.70 cents.....	.971	.962	.971	3.25 cents.....	1.585	1.52	1.585
1.75 cents.....	.985	.974	.985	3.30 cents.....	1.605	1.538	1.605
1.80 cents.....	1.005	.987	1.005	3.35 cents.....	1.625	1.556	1.625
1.85 cents.....	1.025	1.108	1.025	3.40 cents.....	1.645	1.574	1.645
1.90 cents.....	1.045	1.029	1.045	3.45 cents.....	1.665	1.593	1.665
1.95 cents.....	1.065	1.047	1.065	3.50 cents.....	1.685	1.611	1.685
2 cents.....	1.085	1.065	1.085	3.55 cents.....	1.705	1.629	1.705
2.05 cents.....	1.105	1.085	1.105	3.60 cents.....	1.725	1.647	1.725
2.10 cents.....	1.125	1.102	1.125	3.65 cents.....	1.745	1.666	1.745
2.15 cents.....	1.145	1.120	1.145	3.70 cents.....	1.765	1.683	1.765
2.20 cents.....	1.165	1.138	1.165	3.75 cents.....	1.785	1.702	1.785
2.25 cents.....	1.185	1.156	1.185	3.80 cents.....	1.805	1.72	1.805
2.30 cents.....	1.205	1.174	1.205	3.85 cents.....	1.825	1.738	1.825
2.35 cents.....	1.225	1.193	1.225	3.90 cents.....	1.845	1.756	1.845
2.40 cents.....	1.245	1.211	1.245	3.95 cents.....	1.865	1.774	1.865
2.45 cents.....	1.265	1.229	1.265	4 cents.....	1.885	1.793	1.885
2.50 cents.....	1.285	1.247	1.285				

1. That all finished steel one-third above the scale price for shingling be paid.
2. That shingler's helper receive not less than one-third and 5 per cent, and when two helpers are employed they shall receive not less than one-fourth each. Wages to be paid by the shingler.

*Bar and 12-inch mills—Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement, per ton of 2,240 pounds.*

Bar iron.	Heater.	Roller.	Catcher.	Rougher-down and rougher-up, each.	Roughing hook.	Finishing hook and hooker-in, each.
1 cent.....	\$0.59	\$0.376	\$0.202	\$0.18	\$0.09	\$0.087
1.05 cents.....	.596	.38	.204	.182	.091	.088
1.10 cents.....	.602	.384	.206	.184	.092	.089
1.15 cents.....	.608	.388	.208	.186	.093	.09
1.20 cents.....	.614	.392	.210	.188	.094	.091
1.25 cents.....	.62	.396	.212	.19	.095	.092
1.30 cents.....	.624	.444	.237	.213	.106	.102
1.35 cents.....	.707	.452	.241	.217	.108	.104
1.40 cents.....	.720	.460	.246	.221	.110	.106
1.45 cents.....	.733	.468	.250	.225	.112	.108
1.50 cents.....	.746	.477	.255	.229	.114	.110
1.55 cents.....	.760	.486	.260	.233	.116	.112
1.60 cents.....	.774	.495	.264	.236	.119	.115
1.65 cents.....	.788	.504	.269	.242	.121	.117
1.70 cents.....	.802	.513	.274	.246	.123	.119
1.75 cents.....	.817	.523	.279	.251	.125	.121
1.80 cents.....	.836	.535	.286	.258	.129	.125
1.85 cents.....	.855	.548	.294	.263	.131	.127
1.90 cents.....	.876	.561	.300	.270	.134	.130
1.95 cents.....	.896	.574	.308	.276	.138	.134
2 cents.....	.917	.587	.314	.282	.141	.137
2.05 cents.....	.938	.600	.321	.288	.144	.140
2.10 cents.....	.958	.613	.327	.295	.148	.144

*Bar and 12-inch mills—Based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement, per ton of 2,240 pounds—Continued.*

Bar iron.	Heater.	Roller.	Catcher.	Rougher-down and rougher-up, each.	Roughing hook.	Finishing hook and hooker-in, each.
2.15 cents.....	\$0.979	\$0.626	\$0.334	\$0.301	\$0.151	\$0.147
2.20 cents.....	1.000	.639	.341	.307	.154	.150
2.25 cents.....	1.020	.652	.347	.314	.158	.154
2.30 cents.....	1.041	.665	.354	.320	.161	.157
2.35 cents.....	1.062	.678	.361	.326	.164	.160
2.40 cents.....	1.082	.691	.367	.333	.168	.164
2.45 cents.....	1.103	.704	.374	.339	.171	.167
2.50 cents.....	1.124	.717	.381	.345	.174	.169
2.55 cents.....	1.144	.730	.387	.352	.178	.174
2.60 cents.....	1.165	.743	.394	.358	.181	.177
2.65 cents.....	1.186	.756	.401	.364	.184	.180
2.70 cents.....	1.206	.769	.408	.371	.188	.184
2.75 cents.....	1.227	.782	.414	.377	.191	.187
2.80 cents.....	1.248	.795	.421	.383	.194	.190
2.85 cents.....	1.268	.808	.427	.390	.198	.194
2.90 cents.....	1.289	.821	.434	.396	.201	.197
2.95 cents.....	1.310	.834	.441	.402	.204	.200
3 cents.....	1.330	.847	.447	.408	.206	.204
3.05 cents.....	1.351	.860	.454	.415	.211	.207
3.10 cents.....	1.372	.873	.461	.421	.214	.210
3.15 cents.....	1.392	.886	.467	.428	.218	.214
3.20 cents.....	1.413	.899	.474	.434	.221	.217
3.25 cents.....	1.434	.912	.481	.440	.224	.220
3.30 cents.....	1.454	.925	.487	.447	.228	.224
3.35 cents.....	1.475	.938	.494	.453	.231	.227
3.40 cents.....	1.496	.951	.501	.459	.234	.230
3.45 cents.....	1.516	.964	.507	.466	.238	.234
3.50 cents.....	1.537	.977	.514	.472	.241	.237
3.55 cents.....	1.538	.990	.521	.478	.244	.240
3.60 cents.....	1.579	1.003	.527	.485	.248	.244
3.65 cents.....	1.599	1.016	.534	.491	.251	.247
3.70 cents.....	1.620	1.029	.541	.497	.254	.250
3.75 cents.....	1.640	1.042	.547	.504	.258	.254
3.80 cents.....	1.661	1.055	.554	.510	.261	.257
3.85 cents.....	1.682	1.068	.561	.516	.264	.260
3.90 cents.....	1.702	1.081	.567	.523	.268	.264
3.95 cents.....	1.723	1.094	.574	.529	.271	.267
4 cents.....	1.744	1.107	.581	.536	.274	.270

1. All sizes below 1-inch rounds, seven-eighths squares, and all flats weighing less per foot than 1½ by one-half when worked on bar and 12-inch mills, guide mill prices shall be paid. When working 1-inch hand rounds on bar and 12-inch mills, guide mill prices shall be paid.

2. Roughing up and roughing down on bar mills shall be paid the rates enumerated above except when present practice exceeds above rates.

3. Where rougher has charge of guides and fixings, 2 cents extra per ton shall be paid by the roller.

4. Heating nail plate and sheet and tin bar to be same price as bar mill heating.

5. Heaters on 12-inch mill to be paid by company.

6. On all bar mills working bar or skelp iron, one man's help shall be furnished by the firm on piles of 150 pounds and over, and an additional man for 250 pounds, to shove in at the rolls on all passes. This shall not apply to mills now giving extra help.

7. When working hand rounds, or when working solid steel on straight two-high bar mills, clause 17 shall not apply. When working frog fillings on straight two-high bar mills, 6 per cent less than iron prices shall be paid.

8. When crop ends run to excessive lengths, an effort shall be made by the management to correct the abuse, but when said excessive crop ends are sold as finished material at any later period, full scale prices shall be paid. All faggots or scrap piles shall be piled on scales and an effort be made during the year to arrive at an equitable percentage.

9. For all steel flats worked on two-high finishing rolls the price paid shall be the same as iron on bar mills.

10. Where improved machinery, such as straightening machines, are installed to do away with men that were acting as straighteners, the company shall furnish equal amount of help when changing rolls.

11. The wages of all men working on bar and 12-inch mills, not mentioned in the above scale, to advance and decline in proportion to bar and 12-inch

scale. This applies to heaters' helpers, firemen, run downs, hook ups, straighteners, stranners, and dragouts.

12. The company shall pay firemen on coal-heating furnaces, stokers included, except where the production of solid body of steel is 50 per cent or more in any pay period; then the company shall pay one-half, except where present practice requires full payment.

13. Night-turn roller shall receive not less than 72.2 per cent of the straight price for rolling.

14. Where a mixed heat of iron and steel is worked and the majority of the heat is iron, then the whole heat shall be paid for at iron prices.

15. One hour and 30 minutes shall be the limited time for holding heats in heating furnaces after hot, where it is no fault of the crew, but if at the request of manager the heat shall be held longer an average output shall be paid for all time the crew waits after 1 hour and 30 minutes.

16. Catcher's helper shall receive not less than one-third of catcher's wages. This not to be used to reduce helpers receiving higher wages.

17. The prices for working solid steel, including steel rounds and squares for munitions and other purposes, that have been sheared and cut to uniform length, shall be as follows: Bar mill rolling and heating to be 12 per cent less than iron prices. Catching to be 9 per cent less than iron prices. Roughing up and roughing down to be 6 per cent less than iron prices. When the output on steel is but three-fourths the output of iron, it shall be paid for at price and one-half price of iron.

18. When working iron or steel weighing 125 pounds or more, extra help shall be furnished to the heater, the same to be paid by the company. Said help shall also assist the run down to charge.

19. The charging time on bar and 12-inch mills working single turn shall in no case exceed 9 hours and 15 minutes from the regular time the mill begins to roll until the first furnace commences to charge the last heat. On two-turn mills the charging time shall in no case exceed 8 hours from the regular time the mill begins to roll until the first furnace commences to charge the last heat; on three-turn mills continuous operation shall apply. This shall not apply to mills working shorter charging hours.

20. All mills will be allowed to work three turns when practicable. On all mills working three turns 8 hours shall constitute a day's work. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 o'clock Monday morning, and the week's work shall finish after the first shift on Saturday. On Saturdays and days preceding Christmas and Fourth of July, first furnace shall cease charging 6½ hours from the regular time mill begins to roll. On all mills working three turns a third roller shall be employed.

21. On bar and 12-inch mills averaging 60,000 pounds on one furnace and 90,000 pounds on two furnaces per turn on the 9½-hour system, the eight-hour system should be adopted.

22. Where the loss to crew through working inferior material (such as too much hard or high carbon steel mixed in piles) exceeds the normal mill loss by one-sixth, the excess loss shall be paid for by the company.

23. An extra man shall be furnished roughing hook on all piles weighing 350 pounds or over, this not to apply to mills who now receive extra help.

24. The company shall make it the duty of one of the men employed as help around the furnace to assist heater in carrying hook.

25. Company shall put up water shields on all heating furnaces.

26. On bar and 12-inch mills where roughers work without a hooker up, guide mill prices for roughing shall be paid.

27. When sheet or tin bars are made from piles or fagots, all iron turned out shall be paid for with 10 per cent off for clippings.

*Prices for mills making a specialty of working pipe or skelp from iron or steel.*

Rolling	-----	\$0.338
Heating	-----	.59

1. Catching shall be 10 per cent less than bar-mill catching and shall be paid by the company.

2. Roughing up and roughing down shall be 10 per cent less than bar-mill roughing.

3. One man's help shall be furnished by the company on piles of 150 pounds, and an additional man on piles of 250 pounds to shove under at the rolls on all passes.

4. Prices to advance and decline in the same ratio as bar-mill scales.

5. Steel prices to be 6 per cent less than iron prices, except on heating, which shall be 12 per cent less.

6. Bar and 12-inch mills when working skelp shall be paid skelp prices only when mill makes 50 per cent or more in any pay period. Guide-mill prices to be paid only on sizes below 4½ by 117.

7. When working iron or steel weighing 125 pounds or more, extra help shall be furnished to the heater, the same to be paid by the company. Said help shall also assist the run down to charge.

8. Mills will be allowed to work three turns when practicable. On all mills working three turns, eight hours shall constitute a day's work. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 o'clock Monday morning, and the week's work shall finish after the first shift on Saturday. On Saturdays and days preceding Christmas and Fourth of July, first furnace shall cease charging six and one-half hours from the regular time mill begins to roll. On all mills working three turns a third roller shall be employed.

9. All 10-inch and guide mills with one furnace averaging \$35 per turn or more, or with two furnaces \$65 per turn or more on a nine and one-quarter hour system, based on a 1 cent card rate, the eight-hour system should be adopted. On bar and 12-inch mills averaging 60,000 pounds on one furnace, and 90,000 pounds on two furnaces per turn on the nine and one-quarter hour system, the eight-hour system should be adopted.

10. The time on skelp mills shall in no case exceed eight hours from the regular time the mill begins to roll until the first furnace commences to charge the last heat. This shall not apply to mills working shorter charging hours. The time for meals on following-up mills shall not be counted in.

11. The company shall put up water shields on all heating furnaces.

#### PLATE AND TANK MILLS.

Plate and tank mills, when working pipe iron or steel at 1 cent rate, the price shall be as follows, and shall advance and decline in the same ratio as plate-mill scale:

	Per ton.
Rolling-----	\$0.57.3
Heating-----	.68.1

1. It is understood that none of the above prices will be used as a criterion to reduce the prices paid for working other material.

#### GUIDE, 10-INCH, HOOP, AND COTTON-TIE MILLS.

It is agreed that the base price at a 1 cent card rate based on actual sales of bar iron, as per conference agreement, with extras shall be the straight 75.3 cents per ton for rolling, 59 cents for heating, 30.4 cents per ton each for roughing and catching, 15.2 cents per ton each for strander up and strander down on guide, 10-inch, hoop, and cotton-tie mills.

With the following percentage of increase as enumerated below for each member of the crew, on each 5 cents advance in card rate above the base rate of 1 cent.

The rollers, heaters, roughers, catchers, and stranders shall each be paid by the company. It is understood, however, that this arrangement shall in no way detract from the authority of the roller in controlling all hands on mill, including hiring and discharging, and, as heretofore, the roller shall be held responsible for the work done.

Price paid for heating on all base sizes shall be the same as paid on bar mills.

#### Percentage of increase

	Per cent.		Per cent.
1 cent-----	0	1.45 cents-----	22½
1.05 cents-----	1	1.50 cents-----	24
1.10 cents-----	2	1.55 cents-----	26½
1.15 cents-----	3	1.60 cents-----	28½
1.20 cents-----	4	1.65 cents-----	30½
1.25 cents-----	5	1.70 cents-----	32½
1.30 cents-----	16½	1.75 cents-----	34½
1.35 cents-----	18½	1.80 cents-----	37
1.40 cents-----	20½	1.85 cents-----	39½

	Per cent.		Per cent.
1.90 cents	42	3 cents	97
1.95 cents	44½	3.05 cents	99½
2 cents	47	3.10 cents	102
2.05 cents	49½	3.15 cents	104½
2.10 cents	52	3.20 cents	107
2.15 cents	54½	3.25 cents	109½
2.20 cents	57	3.30 cents	112
2.25 cents	59½	3.35 cents	114½
2.30 cents	62	3.40 cents	117
2.35 cents	64½	3.45 cents	119½
2.40 cents	67	3.50 cents	122
2.45 cents	69½	3.55 cents	124½
2.50 cents	72	3.60 cents	127
2.55 cents	74½	3.65 cents	129½
2.60 cents	77	3.70 cents	132
2.65 cents	79½	3.75 cents	134½
2.70 cents	82	3.80 cents	137
2.75 cents	84½	3.85 cents	139½
2.80 cents	87	3.90 cents	142
2.85 cents	89½	3.95 cents	144½
2.90 cents	92	4 cents	147
2.95 cents	94½		

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and cat-her, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
★ rounds and squares.	\$7.991	\$2.711	\$1.98	\$1.10	\$0.55
★ rounds and squares.	6.432	2.185	1.595	.884	.442
★ rounds and squares.	4.957	1.683	1.228	.682	.341
★ rounds and squares.	3.937	1.338	.977	.541	.27
★ rounds and squares.	3.372	1.144	.836	.464	.232
★ and ½ rounds and squares.	2.68	.908	.664	.369	.185
★ rounds and squares.	2.57	.874	.638	.353	.176
★ and ½ rounds and squares.	2.445	.83	.607	.336	.168
★ and up rounds and squares.	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152
★ inch scant ½	2.853	.968	.707	.392	.196
★ inch scant ½	3.654	1.241	.906	.502	.251
★ inch scant ½	5.177	1.758	1.283	.712	.356
★ by ½ oval.	6.496	2.206	1.61	.893	.447
★ by ½ oval.	4.59	1.55	1.138	.631	.315
★ by ½ oval.	7.04	2.39	1.746	.968	.484
★ by ½ oval.	7.612	2.582	1.888	1.047	.524
★ and ½ by ½ oval.	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
★ and ½ oval.	4.052	1.377	1.006	.557	.278
★ and ½ oval.	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
★ oval.	2.68	.91	.664	.369	.184
★ and up oval.	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152
★ half round.	7.265	2.465	1.80	1.00	.50
★ half round.	6.815	2.315	1.69	.937	.468
★ half round.	4.052	1.375	1.005	.557	.279
★ half oval and half round.	3.146	1.068	.78	.433	.216
★ half oval and half round.	2.68	.908	.664	.369	.185
★ half oval and half round.	2.445	.83	.607	.336	.168
★ by No. 18 star iron.	6.496	2.206	1.61	.893	.447

NUT SCALE.

★ to ★ by ★ to ★	\$9.56	\$3.246	\$2.37	\$1.315	\$0.657
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	7.652	2.598	1.898	1.062	.526
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	6.80	2.307	1.687	.935	.468
★ to ★ by ★ to ★	5.784	1.958	1.43	.792	.396
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
★ to ★ by ★ to ★	4.052	1.377	1.006	.557	.278
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	3.496	1.183	.865	.479	.24
★ to ★ by ★ to ★	3.146	1.068	.78	.433	.216
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	3.02	1.024	.75	.415	.208
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	2.91	.988	.722	.40	.20
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	2.81	.955	.697	.386	.193
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	2.68	.91	.664	.369	.184
★ to ★ by ★ to ★	2.57	.872	.638	.353	.177
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	2.445	.83	.607	.336	.168
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	2.355	.792	.603	.32	.16
★ by ★ to ★ by ★	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152

1. All sizes lighter than  $\frac{1}{8}$  by  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  when made on two high-strand rolls, 10 per cent extra shall be paid on above prices.

2. When any size is ordered by decimals and not provided for in scale, it shall be the mean between next higher and lower price.

## ANGLES.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
$\frac{1}{2}$ and upward.....	\$2.255	\$0.753	\$0.59	\$0.304	\$0.152
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $\frac{1}{4}$ two-high rolls.....	2.323	.78	.585	.316	.158
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $\frac{1}{2}$ .....	2.81	.955	.697	.384	.193
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $\frac{3}{4}$ .....	3.146	1.048	.78	.433	.216
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1$ .....	3.591	1.219	.89	.494	.247
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{4}$ .....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{2}$ .....	5.214	1.769	1.293	.717	.359
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ .....	6.428	2.182	1.594	.884	.442

1. All angles under one-eighth in thickness 10 per cent advance on above prices.

2. All angles of unequal sides shall be divided; for instance,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  by 1 inch shall be classed with  $1\frac{1}{2}$  angle.

## CHANNEL IRON.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $\frac{1}{4}$ to by $\frac{1}{2}$ and heavier.....	\$2.255	\$0.753	\$0.59	\$0.304	\$0.152
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $\frac{1}{2}$ to by $\frac{3}{4}$ and heavier.....	2.57	.874	.638	.353	.176
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $\frac{3}{4}$ to by $1$ and heavier.....	2.57	.874	.638	.353	.176
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1$ to by $1\frac{1}{4}$ and heavier.....	2.858	.989	.709	.383	.197
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{4}$ to by $1\frac{1}{2}$ and heavier.....	2.68	.910	.664	.349	.184
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{2}$ to by $1\frac{3}{4}$ and heavier.....	3.24	1.099	.803	.446	.222
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	4.052	1.375	1.005	.557	.279
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by $1\frac{3}{4}$ and heavier.....	2.68	.910	.664	.349	.184
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	3.616	1.227	.897	.497	.249
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	4.507	1.530	1.117	.62	.310
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by $1\frac{3}{4}$ and heavier.....	3.544	1.202	.88	.487	.244
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	4.722	1.605	1.171	.649	.324
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	5.894	2.002	1.462	.81	.405
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	5.445	1.849	1.35	.749	.374
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	7.2.5	2.465	1.80	1.00	.500
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	6.151	2.068	1.525	.846	.423
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	8.176	2.776	2.028	1.124	.562
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	7.194	2.44	1.784	.99	.495
$\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{3}{4}$ to by No. 13 and lighter.....	9.56	3.246	2.37	1.315	.657

## 10-INCH MILL.

$\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$ rounds and squares.....	\$2.445	\$0.83	\$0.607	\$0.336	\$0.168
$\frac{1}{2}$ and upward, rounds and squares.....	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152
ovals.....	2.68	.91	.664	.349	.184
ovals and upward.....	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152
by $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ .....	2.68	.91	.664	.349	.184
by $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ .....	2.445	.83	.607	.336	.168
by $\frac{3}{4}$ to $1$ .....	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152
1 inch and upward.....	2.57	.874	.638	.353	.176
$\frac{1}{2}$ and upward hoop by $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152
2 and upward to No. 15.....	2.57	.874	.638	.353	.176
Lighter than No. 15.....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
Bands rolled specially for bundling.....	2.255	.753	.59	.304	.152
Billets.....					



## HOOP AND COTTON-TIE MILLS.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
24 and upward to No. 15.....	\$2.255	\$0.753	\$0.59	\$0.374	\$0.152
Lighter than No. 15.....	2.57	.874	.638	.373	.176
14 milk-ten hoops.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
14 and 2 by No. 10 and lighter.....	2.57	.874	.638	.353	.176
14 and 1 by No. 10 and lighter.....	2.68	.91	.664	.339	.184
14 ratchet iron.....	2.895	.983	.718	.338	.190
14 and 1 by No. 10 and lighter.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	3.24	1.099	.803	.446	.223
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	4.052	1.377	1.005	.557	.278
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	3.616	1.227	.897	.497	.249
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	4.173	1.416	1.035	.574	.337
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	5.214	1.771	1.263	.717	.358
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	4.722	1.603	1.171	.649	.325
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	5.894	2.002	1.462	.81	.405
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	4.932	1.675	1.223	.678	.339
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	6.60	2.241	1.637	.907	.454
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	5.445	1.849	1.35	.749	.374
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	7.265	2.465	1.80	1.00	.50
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	6.151	2.088	1.525	.846	.423
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	8.176	2.776	2.028	1.124	.562
1 by No. 10 11 and 12.....	7.194	2.44	1.784	.99	.495
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	9.56	3.246	2.37	1.315	.657
1 by No. 13 to 16.....	9.56	3.246	2.37	1.315	.657
Lighter than 14.....	13.79	4.682	3.42	1.896	.948
Clips.....	2.68	.91	.664	.399	.184
State.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
Finer.....	2.68	.91	.664	.399	.184
Cotton tie.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217

1. All sizes No. 24 and lighter, 25 per cent advance upon above prices.

2. On hoops three-fourths inches and wider and No. 20 and heavier, 10 per cent off roller's column and 5 per cent off heater's column off prices in above list; this to apply only to mills making a specialty of hoop and cotton tie.

## HAME IRON.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
1 by No. 10 and lighter.....	\$7.265	\$2.465	\$1.80	\$1.00	\$0.50
1 by No. 10 and lighter.....	5.894	2.002	1.462	.81	.405
1 by No. 10 and lighter.....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
Bands rolled specially for bundling.....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31

## T IRON.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
14 and upward.....	\$2.445	\$0.83	\$0.607	\$0.338	\$0.168
14 and upward.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
14 and upward.....	3.571	1.219	.89	.494	.247
1 inch.....	4.052	1.377	1.005	.557	.278
1 inch.....	5.214	1.771	1.263	.717	.358
1 by 1/2.....	5.214	1.771	1.263	.717	.358
1 by 1/2.....	6.282	2.132	1.558	.864	.432
1 by 1/2.....	7.33	2.488	1.818	1.008	.504
1 by 1/2.....	8.376	2.846	2.078	1.151	.575
1 by 1/2 Y steel.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217

1. Y steel, 10 per cent extra for cut lengths.

2. That any tees of unequal size should be classed thus, 1 by 1/2 shall be classed as 1/2 tees.

3. All tees No. 11 and lighter be paid for at 10 per cent above scale prices.

## CLIP AND WAGON STRAP.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
.....	\$2.445	\$0.83	\$0.607	\$0.326	\$0.168
.....	2.68	.91	.664	.369	.184
.....	2.895	.963	.718	.398	.199
.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
.....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
.....	5.422	1.843	1.345	.745	.372
.....	6.806	2.31	1.688	.936	.468

## HALF OVAL.

All half ovals below regular gauge, one-fourth the thickness of its width, shall be paid for as follows, the same to advance and decline as per regular scale:

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
.....	\$6.518	\$2.214	\$1.616	\$0.896	\$0.448
.....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
.....	3.832	1.302	.96	.527	.263

All half ovals No. 11 gauge and lighter shall be paid for at straight hoop prices.

## CRESCENT BAR.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
1 by No. 10, 11, and 12.....	\$3.146	\$1.066	\$0.78	\$0.433	\$0.217
1 by No. 13 and lighter.....	3.597	1.219	.892	.495	.248
by No. 10, 11, and 12.....	3.24	1.099	.803	.446	.223
by No. 13 and lighter.....	4.062	1.377	1.006	.557	.278
by No. 10, 11, and 12.....	3.616	1.227	.897	.497	.249
by No. 13 and lighter.....	4.507	1.53	1.117	.62	.31
by No. 10, 11, and 12.....	4.723	1.606	1.171	.649	.324
by No. 13 and lighter.....	5.894	2.002	1.462	.81	.406
by No. 10, 11, and 12.....	5.445	1.849	1.35	.749	.374
by No. 13 and lighter.....	7.265	2.465	1.80	1.00	.50
by No. 10, 11, and 12.....	7.194	2.44	1.784	.99	.496
by No. 13 and lighter.....	9.56	3.244	2.37	1.315	.658

1. All sizes made from a regular 2-inch and lighter reworked billet made from all muck iron or from a fagot or fishplate pile that can be worked into finished material on initial heat shall be paid for at 10½ cents per ton less for rolling, 5½ cents per ton less for heating, and 2½ cents per ton less for roughing and catching, each, than above prices. And on all products, except cotton ties, made from 1½ and lighter soft steel billet, 21 cents per ton for rolling, 10½ cents for heating, 5½ cents per ton each for roughing and catching less than the above prices. This not to apply to base sizes.

2. For cut hoops, No. 10 and lighter, the following extras shall be paid: Rolling, 13 cents; heating, 6 cents; roughing and catching, each, 3 cents per ton.

3. Any smaller sizes not enumerated in the 10-inch scale shall be paid the same as guide mill prices.

4. Prices paid for making odd sizes not enumerated in the scale shall be the means between next higher and lower prices.
5. Where 10-inch, guide, hoop, and cotton tie mills average \$27.60 to \$39.70 per turn, such mills shall constitute a two-man job on roughing rolls with an extra man for June, July, and August; and when mills average over \$39.70 to \$58 it shall constitute a three-man job with an extra man for June, July, and August; over \$58 it shall constitute a four-man job with an extra man for June, July, and August. The following shall be the method of determining what roller shall pay for extra rougher: One-sixth the wages of rougher and roughers-up wages on two-man job, and on three-man job, or more, one-seventh, roller to pay no part when the extra man is not put on.
6. The night-turn roller shall receive two-fifths of the roller's and strander's combined wages on said night-turn.
7. When 4 by 4 billets weighing less than 60 pounds are worked, a hook-up shall be paid on roughing rolls by roller.
8. On Belgian mills the extra man required between the roughing and finishing rolls shall be paid by the company.
9. Wages of all guide mill hands not provided for in scale shall rise or decline with roller's wages.
10. When working nonuniform billets, such as cuttings, cobbles, scrap-yard billets, 21 cents for rolling, 10½ cents for heating, and 5½ cents for roughing and catching; each shall be added to straight price per ton for working piles. This only to apply when average output is reduced one-sixth or more.
11. The company shall pay the firemen on coal heating furnaces, stokers included, except where the production of solid body of steel is 50 per cent or more in any pay period; then the company shall pay one-half, except where present practice requires full payment.
12. Where the loss to crew, through working inferior material (such as too much hard or high carbon steel mixed in piles) exceeds the normal mill loss by one-sixth the excess loss shall be paid for by the company.
13. One hour and 30 minutes shall be the limited time for holding heats in heating furnaces after hot, where it is no fault of the crew, but if at the request of manager the heat shall be held longer an average output shall be paid for all time the crew waits after 1 hour and 30 minutes.
14. The tread or base measurement of cushion and channel tire shall be the size at which the same shall be paid for according to channel iron scale.
15. When crop ends run excessive lengths, an effort shall be made by the management to correct the abuse; but when said excessive crop ends are sold as finished material at any later period, full scale prices shall be paid. All fagots or scrap piles shall be piled on scales and an effort be made during the year to arrive at an equitable percentage.
16. When working steel, including steel rounds and squares for munitions and other purposes, that have been sheared and cut to uniform length, guide mill rolling, heating, and roughing each shall be 9 per cent less than prices for working iron, except when rolling 1½-inch solid steel billet or smaller, when clause No. 1 under guide mill scale will apply. When the output on steel is but three-fourths the output of iron, it shall be paid for at price and one-half price of iron.
17. When working iron or steel weighing 125 pounds or more, extra help shall be furnished to the heater, the same to be paid by the company. Said help shall also assist the run-down to charge.
18. The time on guide, 10-inch, hoop and cotton tie mills, working single turn shall in no case exceed 9 hours and 15 minutes from the regular time the mill begins to roll until the first furnace commences to charge the last heat, on two turn-mills the time shall in no case exceed 8 hours. This shall not apply to mills working shorter charging hours. The time for meals on follow-up mills shall not be counted in.
19. All mills will be allowed to work three turns when practicable. On all mills working three turns, eight hours shall constitute a day's work. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 o'clock Monday morning, and the week's work shall finish after the first shift on Saturday. On Saturdays and days preceding Christmas and Fourth of July, first furnace shall cease charging 6½ hours from the regular time the mill begins to roll. On all mills working three turns, a third roller shall be employed.
20. All 10-inch guide and hoop mills with one furnace averaging \$35 per turn or more, or with two furnaces \$65 per turn or more on a nine and one-

quarter hour system, based on a 1-cent card rate, the eight-hour system should be adopted.

21. No rougher on straight train 10-inch mill shall enter billet in stran rolls where edger is used as billet boy. This not to apply where hook is used on larger orders.

22. Company shall put up water shields on all heating furnaces.

## SPECIAL SHAPE SCALE.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and strander down, each.
4 step pad.....	\$2.420	\$0.625	\$0.602	\$0.334	\$0.167
3½ step pad.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
3 step pad.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Bolster plate.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
2½ box rod nuts.....	2.420	.325	.602	.334	.167
Buggy loops.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
Road wagon loop.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
Spring wagon loop.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Phæton loop.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Surry loop.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Superior loop.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Newport loop.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Spring bar.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
3-prong step bar.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Sleigh shaft steel.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ half-round edge stub.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ half-round edge stub.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ bevel-edge stub.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ bevel-edge stub.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ bevel-edge stub.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1 by ½ bevel-edge stub.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
1½ auto rim.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
1 auto rim.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
1 auto rim.....	3.433	1.166	.852	.472	.236
Bailey bar.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Surry bar.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ wrench steel.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ brake ratchet.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Hammer straps.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
Clevis.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ sleigh shoe.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
1½ sleigh shoe.....	2.80	.95	.694	.385	.193
channel reach.....	4.041	1.371	1.002	.556	.278
channel reach.....	5.282	1.794	1.31	.726	.363
channel toe rail.....	3.93	1.335	.975	.54	.27
half-round toe rail.....	3.43	1.164	.85	.472	.236
2½ archer rub.....	2.80	.95	.694	.385	.193
2 channel rub.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
2 wagon rub.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
2 channel rub.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
1½ carriage rub.....	2.80	.951	.694	.385	.193
1½ carriage rub.....	3.433	1.166	.852	.472	.236
1½ carriage rub.....	3.93	1.335	.975	.54	.27
1½ clip ties.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ clip ties.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
1½ clip ties.....	2.420	.825	.602	.334	.167
No. 9 pole cap.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
No. 12 pole cap.....	2.80	.95	.694	.385	.193
No. 14 pole cap.....	3.09	1.06	.766	.425	.213
crimped toe rail.....	5.245	1.78	1.301	.721	.361
surry toe rail.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
1 by ½ stovo leg.....	3.738	1.269	.927	.514	.257
1 park seat.....	3.93	1.335	.975	.54	.27
1 tender plate.....	5.245	1.78	1.301	.721	.361
1-inch and ¾-inch auto channel.....	2.68	.91	.664	.360	.184
1-inch auto channel.....	3.544	1.202	.88	.487	.244
1-inch auto channel.....	5.445	1.849	1.35	.749	.374
¾-inch auto channel.....	6.151	2.068	1.525	.846	.423
¾-inch auto channel.....	7.194	2.435	1.784	.90	.495

Prices paid for odd sizes not enumerated in the scale shall be the mean between next higher and lower prices.

## CLIP AND WAGON STRAP.

Sizes.	Total.	Roller.	Heater.	Rougher and catcher, each.	Strander up and st ander down, each.
box strap.....	\$2.68	\$0.91	\$0.664	\$0.369	\$0.184
pole cap.....	2.68	.91	.664	.369	.184
box strap.....	2.91	.988	.722	.40	.20
whip strap.....	2.91	.988	.722	.40	.20
box strap.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
side braces.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
whip strap.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
cart heel.....	3.146	1.066	.78	.433	.217
whip strap.....	3.293	1.116	.817	.453	.227
whip strap.....	3.434	1.166	.852	.472	.236
box strap.....	3.434	1.166	.852	.472	.236
arm rail.....	3.434	1.166	.852	.472	.236
side braces.....	4.917	1.669	1.22	.676	.338
sky braces.....	5.915	2.01	1.467	.813	.406
oval shaft steel.....	2.919	.988	.722	.40	.20
auto seat steel.....	2.429	.825	.602	.334	.167
auto seat steel.....	2.429	.825	.602	.334	.167

## ADDENDA.

1. Boilers' and bushelers' helpers to receive not less than 40 per cent of boilers' and bushelers' wages, to be paid by the boiler or busheler.
2. That the amount of all sizes of iron and steel be placed in weight book within a reasonable time and placed where all men can inspect it.
3. The wages of run-downs on bar, 12-inch and guide mills to be not less than 35 per cent of the furnace, same to be paid by the company.
4. On all finishing mills the last furnace shall not charge later than one hour after first furnace. On Saturday and days preceding Christmas and Fourth of July first furnace shall cease charging six and one-half hours from the regular time mill starts to roll.
5. That ice or suitable drinking water be furnished for employees throughout the scale year, in a convenient place for all departments.
6. The company shall take the cinder out of the pit from all heating and busheling furnaces.
7. Heaters' helpers on all finishing mills, who draw and charge half the iron and make half the bottom, shall receive not less than 40 per cent of the furnace, same to be paid by the heater.
8. The company shall furnish help when changing rolls on combination bar and guide mills.
9. In each mill under the jurisdiction of this association the company shall return to the crew as soon as the weights are compiled a classified report of work done, or have same put in a convenient place in mill.

## CONFERENCE ADJUSTMENTS AS PER CONVENTION SCALE.

1. Cleaning of grates and getting furnaces hot, satisfactorily arranged between parties interested.
2. Roll changing at end of turn on Saturdays not to be a general practice.
3. Roller-bearing hook pulleys to be installed where found practicable.
4. Sanding rolls where ragging is not deep enough or removed satisfactorily arranged between parties interested.
5. It is mutually agreed that no proposition will be considered at the next conference which does not conform to article 22, section 1, of the constitution of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of North America.
6. It is agreed that the shipments for the 60 days' examination should close on the 20th of the month instead of the last day of the month for that period, so as to allow examinations to be made 10 days earlier.
7. It is agreed that the eight-hour day shall be put into effect as quickly as business and other conditions will permit and that in the interim the new charging hours, as per changed foot notes, will be effective at once.
8. When working scrap or steel piles on bar and guide mills and on which there is excessive waste, the same shall be considered a grievance.
9. It is mutually understood that chargers will be utilized on cinder bottom furnaces when experiments show that such is practicable.

10. It is mutually agreed that the price for heating carrying extras shall be bar mill price, and the differential over base at 1 cent card, plus percentage of advance as shown in scale.

#### SHEET AND JOBBING MILL SCALE.

It is agreed that when the actual average invoiced selling price of 26, 27, and 28 gauge plain sheet steel f. o. b. mill is \$2.15 per 100 pounds the tonnage rate shall be as below with 1½ per cent increase for each member of the crew for each 5 cents per 100 pounds advance above the said \$2.15 selling price, and 1½ per cent decrease for each member of the crew for each 5 cents per 100 pounds decline in selling price to \$1.80 selling price per 100 pounds.

Where there are local conditions that prevent the full application of this general scale, local arrangements to be effected by the proper officials of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers and the company.

*Per ton of 2,240 pounds.*

Gauge.	Roller.	Heater.	Heater's helper.	Shear-man.	Pair heater.	Rougher.	Catcher.	Matcher.	Doubler.	Total.
8 and H.	\$1.903	\$2.475	\$0.306	\$0.412	\$0.311	\$0.350	\$0.385	\$0.300	\$0.283	\$3.685
9-11	1.003	.482	.340	.459	.347	.390	.429	.323	.315	4.098
12-14	1.206	.579	.409	.553	.416	.468	.515	.400	.377	4.923
15-17	1.426	.669	.473	.637	.458	.523	.575	.448	.422	5.631
18-20	1.774	.813	.575	.774	.557	.615	.677	.528	.497	6.810
21-22	2.001	.915	.646	.871	.626	.692	.761	.595	.560	7.667
23-24	2.319	1.061	.749	1.010	.726	.802	.882	.690	.649	8.888
25-26	2.664	1.220	.862	1.162	.835	.923	1.015	.794	.746	10.221
27	2.895	1.326	.936	1.263	.908	1.003	1.103	.862	.811	11.107
28	3.081	1.411	.997	1.343	.966	1.068	1.175	.919	.862	11.822
29	3.236	1.483	1.048	1.412	1.014	1.122	1.234	.965	.906	12.420
30	3.472	1.590	1.124	1.515	1.083	1.204	1.324	1.034	.972	13.234
31	4.501	2.061	1.455	1.963	1.410	1.559	1.715	1.341	1.261	17.266
32	5.478	2.507	1.772	2.381	1.716	1.897	2.087	1.630	1.533	21.001

*Jobbing mill scale, when working rolls 60 inches or over in length, per ton of 2,240 pounds.*

	8 and H.	9-10	11	12-14	15-17	18-21	22
Roller	\$0.514	\$0.597	\$0.684	\$0.820	\$0.950	\$1.155	\$1.508
Finisher	.179	.208	.238	.285	.330	.402	.524
Heater and helper	.662	.770	.882	1.057	1.225	1.490	1.945
Shearer and helper	.379	.440	.504	.604	.700	.851	1.111
First rougher	.179	.208	.238	.285	.330	.402	.524
Second rougher	.150	.174	.200	.239	.311	.375	.491
First catcher	.179	.208	.238	.285	.330	.402	.524
Second catcher	.138	.160	.183	.220	.285	.346	.451
Third catcher	.123	.143	.164	.196	.255	.312	.405
Fourth catcher	.120	.140	.160	.192	.249	.304	.395
Pair heater	.132	.153	.175	.210	.270	.328	.432
First matcher	.117	.136	.156	.187	.243	.296	.386
Second matcher	.117	.136	.156	.187	.243	.296	.386
	2.980	3.473	3.978	4.767	5.721	6.950	9.083

NOTE.—By agreement, the classification of second and third catcher working rolls 60 inches or over in length has been changed, the former second catcher being classified as third catcher, his work and prices to be the same as when working as second catcher, the former third catcher to be classified as second catcher, his work and prices to be the same as when formerly working as third catcher.

*Jobbing mill scale when working rolls are less than 60 inches in length.*

	8 and H.	9-11	12-14	15-17	18-21	22-24	25-26	27
Roller	\$0.651	\$0.713	\$1.052	\$1.219	\$1.483	\$1.936	\$2.065	\$2.224
Finisher	.257	.286	.343	.397	.483	.630	.672	.731
Heater and helper	.727	.845	1.057	1.225	1.490	1.945	2.057	2.255
Shearman and helper	.416	.483	.604	.700	.851	1.111	1.186	1.289
Rougher	.257	.286	.343	.397	.483	.630	.672	.731
First catcher	.257	.286	.343	.397	.483	.630	.672	.731
Second catcher	.186	.210	.248	.327	.397	.519	.558	.606
Third catcher	.182	.203	.243	.321	.391	.509	.547	.596
P. heater	.198	.220	.264	.346	.422	.551	.594	.647
First matcher	.177	.200	.236	.312	.378	.492	.531	.576
Second matcher	.177	.200	.236	.312	.378	.492	.531	.576
	3.485	3.932	4.969	5.953	7.239	9.445	10.085	10.922

THIRD CLASSIFICATION.

When working material on rolls 40 inches and less in length not run over, not open annealed, by the mill crew, and on which an average output of 31,360 pounds per turn can be made.

*Rates.*

	8 and H.	9-11	12-14	15-17	18-21
Roller.....	\$0.651	\$0.713	\$1.052	\$1.219	\$1.483
Heater and helper.....	.436	.507	.634	.735	.894
Shearman and helper.....	.416	.483	.604	.700	.851
Rougher.....	.257	.286	.343	.430	.523
First catcher.....	.257	.286	.343	.430	.523
Second catcher.....	.177	.200	.236	.306	.372
Screw operator.....	.198	.220	.264	.339	.412
First matcher.....	.177	.200	.236	.306	.372
Second matcher.....	.177	.200	.236	.306	.372
	2.746	3.095	3.948	4.771	5.802

It is agreed that any company instituting a mill of this class shall pay sheet-mill prices and employ sheet-mill crew until said 31,360 pounds per turn average output has been reached during a pay period.

*United States standard weight of gauges for iron and steel plates and sheets.*

Gauge.	Weight per square foot in pounds avoirdupois.	Weight per square foot in ounces avoirdupois.	Approximate thickness in fractions of an inch.	Approximate thickness in decimal parts of an inch.
No. 0000000.....	20.00	320	1-2	0.5
No. 000000.....	18.75	300	15-32	.46875
No. 00000.....	17.50	280	7-16	.43775
No. 0000.....	16.25	260	13-32	.40625
No. 000.....	15.	240	3-8	.375
No. 00.....	13.75	220	11-32	.34375
No. 0.....	12.50	200	5-16	.3125
No. 1.....	11.25	180	9-32	.28125
No. 2.....	10.625	170	17-64	.265625
No. 3.....	10.	160	1-4	.25
No. 4.....	9.375	150	15-64	.234375
No. 5.....	8.75	140	7-32	.21875
No. 6.....	8.125	130	13-64	.203125
No. 7.....	7.5	120	3-16	.1875
No. 8.....	6.875	110	11-64	.171875
No. 9.....	6.25	100	5-32	.15625
No. 10.....	5.625	90	9-64	.140625
No. 11.....	5.	80	1-8	.125
No. 12.....	4.375	70	7-64	.109375
No. 13.....	3.75	60	3-32	.09375
No. 14.....	3.125	50	5-64	.078125
No. 15.....	2.8125	45	9-128	.0703125
No. 16.....	2.5	40	1-16	.0625
No. 17.....	2.25	36	9-160	.05625
No. 18.....	2.	32	1-20	.05
No. 19.....	1.75	28	7-160	.04375
No. 20.....	1.50	24	3-80	.0375
No. 21.....	1.375	22	11-320	.034375
No. 22.....	1.25	20	1-32	.03125
No. 23.....	1.125	18	9-320	.028125
No. 24.....	1.	16	1-40	.025
No. 25.....	.875	14	7-320	.021875
No. 26.....	.75	12	3-160	.01875
No. 27.....	.6875	11	11-640	.0171875
No. 28.....	.625	10	1-64	.015625
No. 29.....	.5625	9	9-640	.0140625
No. 30.....	.5	8	1-80	.0125
No. 31.....	.4375	7	7-640	.0109375
No. 32.....	.40625	6	13-1280	.01015625
No. 33.....	.375	6	3-320	.009375
No. 34.....	.34375	5	11-1280	.00859375
No. 35.....	.3125	5	5-640	.0078125
No. 36.....	.28125	4	9-1280	.00703125
No. 37.....	.25	4	17-2560	.00640625
No. 38.....	.25	4	1-160	.00625

That in the practical use and application of the standard gauge hereby established a variation of two and one-half ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ ) per cent either way may be allowed.

Addition by agreement between the tin plate manufacturers and A. A. of I. S. and T. W.:

Gauge.	Weight per square foot in pounds avoirdupois.	Weight per square foot in ounces avoirdupois.	Approximate thickness in fractions of an inch.	Approximate thickness in decimal parts of an inch.
No. 39.....	0.234375	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	3-512	0.006859375
No. 40.....	.21875	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	7-1280	.00546875
No. 41.....	.2109375	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	27-5120	.0052734375
No. 42.....	.203125	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	13-2560	.005078125
No. 43.....	.1963125	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	5-1024	.004878
No. 44.....	.1875	3	3-640	.0046875

The following shall represent the minimum, base, and maximum weight per square foot for each gauge on sheets and plates:

Gauge.	Maxi-mum.	Base.	Mini-mum.	Gauge.	Maxi-mum.	Base.	Mini-mum.
No. 7.....	7.81	7.5	7.19	No. 20.....	1.625	1.5	1.44
No. 8.....	7.18	6.875	6.56	No. 21.....	1.4375	1.375	1.313
No. 9.....	6.55	6.25	5.94	No. 22.....	1.3125	1.25	1.188
No. 10.....	5.93	5.625	5.31	No. 23.....	1.1875	1.125	1.063
No. 11.....	5.30	5	4.69	No. 24.....	1.0625	1	.94
No. 12.....	4.68	4.375	4.06	No. 25.....	.9375	.875	.8126
No. 13.....	4.05	3.75	3.44	No. 26.....	.8125	.75	.719
No. 14.....	3.43	3.125	2.97	No. 27.....	.71875	.6875	.6563
No. 15.....	2.96	2.8125	2.66	No. 28.....	.65625	.625	.594
No. 16.....	2.65	2.5	2.38	No. 29.....	.59375	.5625	.5313
No. 17.....	2.37	2.25	2.13	No. 30.....	.53125	.5	.469
No. 18.....	2.12	2	1.88	No. 31.....	.46875	.4375	.4219
No. 19.....	1.875	1.75	1.63	No. 32.....	.42188	.40625	.3906

NOTE.—The usual  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent variation allowed by the United States standard gauge is included in above figures.

1. That the rougher, pair heater, and matcher be paid 10 per cent above scale on jobbing mills where slabs must be dragged to the rolls.

2. No. 18 gauge and lighter, over 32 inches wide, worked from slabs on sheet or jobbing mills, 8 per cent extra when run over and annealed in open furnace; and for all bars and crop ends from bars and plates to be worked into 18-gauge and lighter, that are not cut to proper lengths and have to be spread on sheet or jobbing mills, 5 per cent extra.

3. All sheet iron or sheet steel or fire bed shall be weighed by the company after being sheared and opened, and the company shall furnish the complete weight and number of sheets of different sizes of each turn to the roller, same to be accessible to each member of the crew.

4. Sixteen per cent added for changed iron and steel.

5. For pickled in the rough, either iron or steel, worked on sheet or jobbing mills, 15 per cent extra shall be paid for same up to and including 22-gauge and 20 per cent for lighter gauges. For pickled bars 10 per cent extra shall be paid. This not to affect local agreements now in force.

6. All iron or steel rolled on sheet or jobbing mills, sheared to patterns of irregular shapes or circles, shall be paid for at the weight of the squared sheet. This clause shall not apply to boiler and tank heads, or any plates or sheets where the waste does not exceed 10 per cent above square sheets; but where the waste does exceed 10 per cent above square sheets, the company agrees to pay 16 per cent extra above scale prices.

7. Sheet or jobbing mills working three turns, the shearing shall be divided between two shear-men on jaw, crocodile, or rotary shears, and no shear-man be allowed to shear more than two turns on jaw or crocodile shears, the maximum not to exceed three turns on squaring shears.

8. Shearing to mean squaring the pack. Sixteen and two-thirds per cent extra for all extra cuts up to four cuts; 20 per cent extra for all extra cuts



from four cuts to eight cuts; 25 per cent extra for all extra cuts over eight cuts.

9. That the rollers on sheet or jobbing mills shall not be permitted to hold more than one turn.

10. Sheet mills working three turns that make tin and black plate may be permitted to work three turns of eight hours each.

11. That all mills working plates and fire bed to No. 19 gauge shall be termed jobbing mills.

12. That plates be designated as ending at No. 8 gauge, and fire bed commence at No. 9 gauge and end at No. 19 gauge, and sheets to commence at No. 20 gauge.

13. When working fire bed on sheet mills that is run over in pairs or threes, or blue annealed in sheet furnace, the sheet heater or helper shall not be required to run pair furnace nor deliver pairs to rolls.

When working fire bed that is finished on the rough heater shall run pair furnace, doubler shall help catcher.

On jobbing mills 60 inches or less, heater to run heating furnace, helper to run annealing furnace.

Extra help shall be furnished as follows: Two men on 36-inch wide and over containing 22 square feet or more, doubled; two men on 55-pound bar and heavier, any width, not finished in the rough; two men on 75-pound bar and heavier, any width, worked in pairs; one man on 36-inch wide and over containing 22 square feet or more, not doubled; one man on 55-pound bar and heavier, any width, not doubled.

No two clauses are to apply to the same order.

Roller shall distribute the extra help.

These clauses not to apply where more help is now furnished.

14. Where improved squaring shears are used, the company shall pay for grinding of the knives; this is to apply to squaring shears only.

15. All defective sheets made on sheet or jobbing mills that will trim 72 inches long by 24 inches wide and larger sizes shall be pair for, and it is also understood that all sheets cut down to smaller sizes for sale be paid for.

16. That extra shearman on squaring shears must take his turn changing and setting the knives.

17. Rollers and crew on sheet or jobbing mills working three turns shall change around from first to second and from second to third turn.

18. All sheets or fire bed rolled on sheet, tin, and jobbing mills required to be sheared shall be pulled up to shearman's standing by the company, ready for shearing.

19. Payment of all regular employees called for in the scale shall be made by the company, and rollers shall be furnished with pay statements of all tonnage men prior to pay day. Such statements to be accessible to each member of the crew interested.

20. When due to shortage of men, one hour shall be the limit of time for sheet or jobbing mill crew to remain in mill without working. And three hours shall be the limit of time when stoppage is caused by breakages. But under no combination of stoppages shall men wait longer than three hours.

21. On mills working three turns, eight hours shall constitute a day's work.

22. For all iron trimmed and annealed in an open furnace, 8 cents for 150 pounds to be paid to the sheet heater, pair heater, matcher, and doubler each.

23. On such orders as company require matcher to sweep every pack, matcher shall receive 10 per cent above scale price.

24. On jobbing mills 60 inches or less in length, where heater employs one helper, said helper shall receive not less than 40 per cent of heater's wages. On jobbing mills over 60 inches in length, where a heater's helper and an annealer is employed, the helper to receive 24 per cent and annealer 19 per cent, a total of 43 per cent, of heater's wages.

25. All mills to divide the work according to custom.

26. That roller pay 7½ cents per 15 pairs for working spanner on chill rolls on all iron or steel, 5 cents per 15 single slabs or bars worked in single piece, and when matcher helps the roller to pull the screw down, also to slack up on the finishers, he shall receive 50 cents per turn additional from the roller; these prices to increase and decrease according to 60-day settlement and to be paid out of office after being deducted from roller's pay.

27. Roughers running over doubled iron or steel, or when giving fire bed, 18-gauge and heavier extra passes after the matching pass, shall receive 12½ cents

per heat of 15 pairs on the base of scale, subject to the sliding scale, 60-day settlement, and to be paid by the roller

28. That all sheet mills working 12 gauge or heavier in pairs; that the roughers' work ends after the last pass of each single bar on chill mills; roller's work to begin with matching pass, meaning first pass after catcher has put the two bars together, and when finished in single bar, roller be required to take charge of roughing one-third of work, present practice of running screw to prevail; but when 12-inch gauge or heavier is worked in pairs and finished in single piece, and when roller takes hold of roughing after third single pass that this be considered as his part of the work and he is not expected to do any of the roughing.

29. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 a. m. Monday except by local agreement between men and management, but in no case shall the mills start earlier than 12.15 a. m. Monday, and the week's work shall finish after the first eight-hour shift on Saturday. Mills working three turns not to begin operation until 8 a. m. after the following holidays: Fourth of July, Labor Day, and Christmas; this not to apply to mills starting work at 5 a. m.

30. On all mills working iron or steel weighing 150 pounds or more, in single piece, extra help shall be furnished to the heater, the same to be paid by the company.

31. All bars scaled in the pair furnace shall be swept up by the pair heater.

32. Company shall be required to furnish swabs for greasing necks.

33. The weight of bar to be marked on bar when brought to the mill, and scales for weighing bars to be furnished.

34. When working sheet or fire bed from charcoal iron, 5 per cent extra shall be paid.

35. That company shall do all necessary Sunday fixing to furnaces, including cutting of grates, drawing of fires in stoker furnaces, cleaning of flues and grease pots; same to be paid by company.

36. When a pair or pack weighs 165 pounds or more, finished weight, the company shall furnish an extra man to help shearman and holdup throw pack up on shears. This not to apply where company has special appliances to help shearman.

#### CONFERENCE ADJUSTMENT.

1. For the purpose of arriving at the average selling price referred to in the preamble of the sheet-mill scale, it is agreed that all manufacturers represented at this conference will report all shipments of Nos. 26, 27, and 28 gauge plain sheet steel f. o. b. mill each 60-day period.

2. That companies agree to hire men for shearman and assist in every way in getting iron sheared and opened. Shearman shall not be required to open iron in event that holdups and openers quit, leaving shearman without help; but shearman shall have full responsibility for and authority over his crew.

3. It is mutually agreed that no proposition will be considered at the next conference which does not conform to article 22, section 1, of the constitution of the A. A. of I. S. and T. W. of N. A.

4. It is mutually agreed that in case of polisher being engaged on other mills, the roller to polish top roll, when necessary, but in no case will he be required to polish bottom rail. Present practice to continue for one year, except where rollers are polishing bottom roll, which practice shall be discontinued.

5. In case of breakages no member shall be suspended or discharged for a longer period than 24 hours without an investigation by mill committee and the management.

6. All men working in sheet and jobbing mills shall receive their money directly from the company.

7. It is agreed that should a national emergency arise whereby the Government needs a greater production of tin plate to conserve necessary foodstuffs, it is understood that the Amalgamated Association will appoint a committee to meet with a committee representing the sheet and tin-plate manufacturers that deal with the Amalgamated Association in conjunction with representatives of the Government, such joint committee to be convened at the initiative of the Government, and that said initiative by the Government shall not be taken at the solicitation or suggestion of interested parties, whether they be employers or employees.

8. When matchers and pair heaters are ordered to throw out more than four 15-pair heats on sheet mill or four 8-pair heats on jobbing mill, the company to compensate the men for the full number of pairs thrown out.

9. When a part of the mill is closed down the work shall be divided as equally as practical among the men.

10. It is mutually agreed that when iron is properly piled once the openers' work is done.

11. It is mutually agreed that no extra floating crews shall be put on on any plant unless mutually satisfactory.

## TIN-MILL SCALE.

It is agreed that when the actual average invoiced selling price of a box of 100 pounds of coke tin plate, prime sheets, is selling at \$3.50 f. o. b. mill, that tonnage rate shall be as below, with a 1 per cent increase for each member of the crew on each 5 cents' advance in the price per box; and 1 per cent decrease for each member of the crew on each 5-cent decrease down to a \$3.20 selling price.

Where there are local conditions that prevent the full application of this general scale local arrangements to be effected by the proper officials of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers and the company.

*Scale per ton of 2,240 pounds.*

Gauge.	Roller.	Rough- er.	Dou- bler.	Helper.	Heater.	Helper.	Catch- ing.	Shear- ing.	Screw boy.	Total
Nos. 8 to 11.....	0.91	0.46	0.51	0.297	0.55	0.399	0.517	0.40	0.627	4.67
Nos. 12 and 13.....	.96	.48	.52	.378	.57	.41	.55	.40	.627	4.815
Nos. 14 and 15.....	1.11	.55	.60	.352	.69	.498	.638	.40	.627	5.463
Nos. 16 and 17.....	1.47	.74	.83	.484	.85	.615	.847	.40	.627	6.853
Nos. 18 to 20.....	1.65	.83	.92	.539	.94	.68	.946	.40	.627	7.532
Nos. 21 to 24.....	1.98	1.00	1.14	.671	1.14	.82	1.045	.40	.748	8.944
Nos. 25 and 26.....	2.10	1.05	1.20	.715	1.25	.907	1.111	.40	.825	9.548
Nos. 27 and 28.....	2.12	1.06	1.26	.748	1.35	.972	1.111	.42	.825	9.866
Nos. 29 and 30.....	2.23	1.11	1.43	.847	1.51	1.09	1.255	.42	.836	10.738
No. 31.....	2.28	1.14	1.51	.902	1.61	1.166	1.298	.42	.847	11.163
No. 32.....	2.38	1.19	1.59	.946	1.69	1.22	1.364	.44	.948	11.768
No. 33.....	2.54	1.27	1.67	.99	1.75	1.252	1.43	.47	.972	12.344
No. 34.....	2.82	1.41	1.79	1.056	1.91	1.371	1.584	.49	1.008	13.439
No. 35.....	2.96	1.47	1.88	1.11	2.03	1.458	1.672	.51	1.044	14.135
No. 36.....	3.15	1.58	1.94	1.144	2.10	1.522	1.782	.53	1.044	14.792
No. 37.....	3.20	1.60	1.96	1.155	2.13	1.533	1.804	.55	1.044	14.976
No. 38.....	3.23	1.61	2.00	1.177	2.17	1.555	1.826	.56	1.044	15.172
No. 39.....	3.40	1.71	2.19	1.298	2.33	1.674	1.914	.57	1.044	16.13
No. 40.....	3.58	1.80	2.48	1.474	2.72	1.954	2.024	.59	1.044	17.666
No. 41.....	3.68	1.84	2.61	1.54	2.85	2.052	2.068	.60	1.044	18.284
No. 42.....	3.80	1.89	2.72	1.606	2.98	2.149	2.112	.61	1.044	19.911
No. 43.....	3.86	1.93	2.84	1.683	3.11	2.235	2.178	.62	1.044	19.50
No. 44.....	3.96	1.98	2.96	1.76	3.24	2.333	2.233	.63	1.044	20.119

1. Twenty per cent added for changed iron and steel.

2. For pickled in the rough, either iron or steel, worked on tin mills 15 per cent extra shall be paid for same up to and including 22-gauge and 20 per cent for lighter gauges. For pickled bars 10 per cent extra shall be paid. This not to affect local agreements now in force.

3. All iron or steel rolled on tin or black plate mills sheared to patterns of irregular shapes or circles, shall be paid for at the weight of the square sheet.

4. All plate and sheets cut down to smaller sizes on tin plate mills, to be paid for at scale prices.

5. That all sheets or black plate 14½ square feet or over, when finished in six or more sheets to the pack, shall be paid for at the following rates above tin plate scale. Ten per cent extra on 26-gauge and heavier, and 20 per cent for all lighter gauges, up to and including 32-gauge, and for all sheets or black plate 15½ square feet and over, finished in fours, the same percentage shall apply.

6. Where improved squaring shears are used, the company shall pay for opening packs and grinding the knives, and in mill where plates are cut to smaller sizes than 14 by 20 inches, additional pay shall be arranged as follows: For four or five cuts, 11 cents per ton above scale price shall be paid, and 5½ cents per ton additional for each extra cut thereafter. It is understood that these are base rates and subject to bimonthly settlements.

7. Eight hours shall be a day's work on tin or black plate mills.
8. The weight of the bar to be marked on the bar when brought to the mill and scales for weighing bars be furnished.
9. All tin and black plate shall be weighed by the company after being sheared and opened, and the company shall furnish complete weight with different sizes of each turn to the roller, same to be accessible to each member of the crew.
10. All tin and black plate shall be weighed by the company after being sheared and opened, and stickers to be opened by the company.
11. That the company furnish soft grease on Monday, and any other warming-up turns, and furnish grease on standing for catcher at all times.
12. That all men working under the control of the Amalgamated Association shall not wait in the mill longer than one hour without working, when stoppage is caused by shortage of men, nor more than three hours when stoppage is due to breakages. But under no combination of stoppages shall men wait longer than three hours.
13. Three turns to constitute a day's work for shearman, except in case of accident or other contingencies.
14. All crop ends shall be paired in equal lengths, and when possible equal weights.
15. The standing turn and level hand men on tin mills shall receive their money directly from the company.
16. That 10 per cent extra be paid for spreading bars.
17. That all iron and steel worked on tin mills, finished in eights heavier than 27-gauge, be paid for at the same rate as 27-gauge.
18. That all cut-downs be marked separately on board.
19. When company requires catcher to break down iron, company shall furnish help; and on all packs 20 by 84 and over, and on all packs which in the judgment of the mill committee and manager, the catcher is unable to pile, extra help shall be furnished and paid by the company.
20. That the company furnish ice or well water to its employees.
21. That 25 per cent shall be paid to shearman on all orders that are cut once on one shears and then taken to another shears to be finished, when there is more than one size in the pack, causing shearman to throw one cut or piece on the floor, that the company furnish a man to pick them up and place them on the bench for shearman.
22. Rolling shall not start earlier than 5 a. m. Monday except by local agreement between men and management, but in no case shall the mill start earlier than 12.15 a. m. Monday, and the week's work shall finish after the first eight-hour shift on Saturday. Mills working three eight-hour turns not to begin operation until 8 a. m. after the following holidays: Fourth of July, Labor Day, and Christmas. This not to apply to mills starting work at 5 a. m.
23. All bars shall be swept by doubler or doubler's helper before or after being placed on the foreplate when in the judgment of the roller such action is necessary to insure perfect plates.
24. Company shall be required to furnish swabs for greasing necks.
25. When 27 or 28 gauge is doubled twice, doubler to receive \$1.30 per ton, helper not less than 70 cents per ton, heater to receive \$1.39 per ton, helper to receive 93 cents per ton.
26. When working charcoal iron on tin or black plate mills, 5 per cent extra shall be paid.
27. Company shall furnish men to change sheet-mill knives where tin shear-men are compelled to cut sizes longer than 40 inches.
28. When tin-mill shear-men are compelled to use sheet-mill shears, company shall not retain any of shear-men's wages to pay holdup.
29. That when 20-gauge or heavier is doubled on tin mills, 24-gauge price shall be paid for same.
30. All sheets or fire bed rolled on tin mills required to be sheared shall be pulled up to shearman's standing by the company, ready for shearing.
31. That company do all necessary Sunday fixing to furnaces, including cutting of grates, drawing of fires in stoker furnaces, cleaning of flues and grease post.

#### CONFERENCE ADJUSTMENTS.

1. It is agreed that the manufacturers will report all shipments of 100-pound coke tin-plate prime sheets of their own manufacture, each 60-day period to establish average selling price referred to in the preamble of tin-mill scale.

2. It is mutually agreed that in case of polisher being engaged on other mills, the roller to polish top roll when necessary, but in no case will he be required to polish bottom roll. Present practice to continue for one year, except where rollers are polishing bottom roll, which practice shall be discontinued.

3. In case of breakage no member shall be suspended or discharged for a longer period than 24 hours without an investigation by mill committee and the management.

4. All men working on tin mills shall receive their money directly from the company.

5. That the work of doubler's helper placing pairs on foreplate was left for local settlement.

6. It is agreed that the company will take charge of bundling of scrap.

7. It is agreed that doubler shall pay not less than 35 per cent of doubler's wages for pair heating.

8. When a part of the mill is closed down the work shall be divided as equally as practical among the men.

9. It is mutually agreed that no proposition will be considered at the next conference which does not conform to.

10. It is mutually agreed that no extra floating crews shall be put in any plant unless mutually satisfactory.

That in order to insure proper distribution of United States standard gauge on tin plates, in conformity with United States standard gauge, the minimum and maximum weight of each gauge shall be as follows:

Gauge.	Minimum weight per box.		Base weight per box.		Maximum weight per box.	
	Pounds.	Ounces.	Pounds.	Ounces.	Pounds.	Ounces.
No. 10.....	1,156	15	1,225	-----	1,293	1
No. 11.....	1,020	13	1,088	14	1,156	14
No. 12.....	844	12	952	12	1,020	12
No. 13.....	748	10	816	11	884	11
No. 14.....	646	8	680	9	748	9
No. 15.....	578	8	612	8	646	7
No. 16.....	517	4	544	7	578	7
No. 17.....	462	12	490	-----	517	3
No. 18.....	408	5	435	9	462	11
No. 19.....	353	14	381	2	408	4
No. 20.....	313	1	326	11	353	13
No. 21.....	285	13	299	7	313	-----
No. 22.....	258	10	272	4	285	12
No. 23.....	231	6	245	-----	258	9
No. 24.....	204	3	217	12	231	5
No. 25.....	176	15	190	9	204	2
No. 26.....	156	8	163	5	176	14
No. 27.....	142	14	149	12	156	7
No. 28.....	129	5	136	2	142	13
No. 29.....	115	11	122	8	129	4
No. 30.....	101	-----	108	14	115	11
No. 31.....	91	-----	95	5	100	15
No. 32.....	85	1	88	8	90	15
No. 33.....	78	4	81	11	85	-----
No. 34.....	71	7	74	14	78	3
No. 35.....	64	10	68	1	71	6
No. 36.....	59	9	61	4	64	9
No. 37.....	56	2	57	14	59	8
No. 38.....	52	12	54	7	56	1
No. 39.....	49	5	51	1	52	11
No. 40.....	46	13	47	10	49	4
No. 41.....	45	1	45	15	46	12
No. 42.....	43	6	44	4	45	-----
No. 43.....	41	11	42	9	43	5
No. 44.....	39	15	40	13	41	10

## TIN-HOUSE SCALE.

When the actual average invoiced selling price of a box of 100 pounds coke tin plate primes is \$3.50 f. o. b. mill, tinner's, redippers', and risers' rates shall be as below, with half of 1 per cent increase for each 5 cents advance in the selling price and half of 1 per cent decrease for each 5 cents decline in the selling price to \$3.50.

Where there are local conditions that prevent the full application of this general scale local arrangements to be effected by the proper officials of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers and the company.

*Rate for 100 base boxes of 31,360 square inches each.*

Pots.	Tinner.		Redipper.		Riser.	
	Large.	Small.	Large.	Small.	Large.	Small.
Coke machines.....	\$8.91	\$11.55	.....	.....	\$5.06	\$7.59
Single tin T. and W. machines.....	10.89	12.76	.....	.....	6.49	7.70
Combination tin.....	9.90	11.11	\$11.77	\$12.65	6.27	7.04
Combination tin, double rolling.....	10.89	11.77	12.65	13.42	7.04	7.92
Edward's machine.....	11.11	12.65	.....	.....	8.36	9.46
Common turne.....	8.91	11.55	.....	.....	5.59	6.49
Combination turne.....	9.99	11.11	12.10	12.65	5.83	6.49
Combination turne, greasy finish.....	10.89	.....	13.42	.....	6.49	.....

#### CLASSIFICATION.

*Coke pots.*—Large plates: All plates over 490 square inches. Small plates: All plates 490 square inches and less. All plates 18 inches and less in width. All plates 22 inches and less in length. All plates run single.

*Single tin T. and W. machines.*—Large plates: All plates over 490 square inches. Small plates: All plates 490 square inches and less. All plates run single lengthwise.

*Combination tin.*—Large plates: All plates over 490 square inches. Small plates: All plates 490 square inches and less. All plates occupying 22 inches and less of the rolls.

*Combination turne.*—Large plates: All plates over 490 square inches. Small plates: All plates 490 square inches and less.

*Common turne.*—Large plates: All plates over 490 square inches. Small plates: All plates 490 square inches and less. All plates run single lengthwise.

1. It is agreed that 31,360 square inches shall be the number of square inches in a box of tin.

2. It is agreed that \$1.50 shall be paid on all single and combination stacks for drossing or cleaning up of stacks, and if required to stay longer than 2½ hours for drossing, that 50 cents for every additional half hour shall be added for tinner, redippers, and risers.

3. Where mechanical catchers are in use the rate for drossing shall be as follows:

For one week's drossing, \$3 per stack; two weeks' drossing, \$4 per stack; three weeks' drossing, \$5 per stack; or for any part of the week thereof. On days when not drossing 50 cents to be paid for cleaning up and covering rolls.

4. Parties of the first part shall report daily the primes, wasters, and menders made by each man working on tinning stacks as soon as can conveniently be done, also report in base boxes, specifying sizes and basis weight of the daily tin-house output. Reckoners to furnish a duplicate direct to tinner. Reckoners and boxers shall also receive a daily report.

5. In cases where employees under the jurisdiction of this association are required to stay in the mill longer than 1½ hours per turn on account of breakage or shortage of material, they shall be paid 50 cents per hour for all time lost.

6. That eight hours shall constitute a day's work on all tinning machines; and that starting and stopping time to be left for local adjustment.

Any variation from this rule to be adjusted locally.

7. That the parties of the first part shall take all material to and from the stacks.

8. Where fractional boxes are produced it is agreed that half-box fractions shall be paid tinner, redippers, and risers.

9. Where turnes are being run which are producing excessive stripper plates (otherwise known as rough plates) the attention of the foreman shall be called to this fact. If he is unable to cause plates to run properly, tinner, redippers, and risers shall be paid for the same. If foreman can run plates properly, all strippers produced shall be treated as menders.

10. Redippers shall be paid 50 cents for cleaning grease pot and putting down machines.

11. It is further agreed that tanners and catchers shall be paid for all menders that are made through no fault of theirs, and reckoners shall score same on reckoners' slip.

12. On all stacks, where possible, drainpipes shall be furnished to run the oil from the oil pot into the tank, drainpipes to be from 3 inches to 6 inches above the metal line.

13. That when plates 45 inches and longer are worked on charcoal stacks a holdup man be furnished on the front end.

14. When redipper is required to nip the rolls on heavy coated terneplates small-iron prices to be paid or a boy furnished to throw metal on the rolls. On heavy coated terne stacks, where the plates are not carrying a sufficient coating, a man shall be furnished to put metal on the rolls.

15. Twenty per cent to be paid above scale rates on all plates 36 inches long and over on combination tin stacks only.

16. All plates weighing over 136 pounds to be paid for as overweight gains, primes and wasters to be figured together.

To determine number of boxes including gains multiply the weight per box by the number of boxes made and divide by 136.

17. It is agreed that all plates weighing 70 pounds or less per box shall be classed as small plates for tanners only.

#### CONFERENCE AGREEMENT.

1. Should the scale for the new year not have been agreed to, and while negotiations are pending, all tin houses shall work up to the 15th of July in order to work up all material made on hot mills up to and including June 30 of each year.

2. Where hand boxes are used the question to be adjusted locally.

3. Rate on long-time stacks to be determined locally.

4. Running scrap or cut down to be adjusted locally.

5. Pay days to conform to hot-mill agreement.

6. All time lost on account of stickers or bad plates left to local adjustment.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you got a copy of the proposal with you?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir; we have.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be inserted in the record.

(The proposals above referred to are here printed in full in the record, as follows:)

YORKVILLE, OHIO, October 7, 1919.

We, the committee representing Liberty Lodge of the Amalgamated Association, submit for the consideration of the Wheeling Steel & Iron Co. the following demands and rates of wages for the crafts enumerated below:

First. A universal eight-hour day, with time and a half for over time and double time for Sundays and holidays.

Second. No member will be discharged because of his membership in a labor union.

#### Wage rates.

	De- manded.	Our present rate.	Per cent increase.
Laborers on cold rolls.....per hour..	\$0.78 <sup>1</sup>	\$0.45 <sup>1</sup>	72
Cold roll roughers and packers (not to open stickers).....	.87 <sup>1</sup>	1.46	50
Openers on cold rolls.....per hour..	.85	1.39	50
Grease boys.....do.....	.70	.40	75
MILLWRIGHTS.			
Steam pipe fitters.....per hour..	1.00	.49	104
Steam pipe fitters' helpers.....do.....	.90	.45	100
Millwright hookup.....do.....	.80	.44	82
First millwright.....do.....	1.00	.50	100
BLACK PICKLERS.			
When five (5) men pack.....per ton..	.12	.0854	40
When four (4) men pack.....do.....	.15	.1068	40
Loaders.....do.....	.11	.0748	47
Machine men.....do.....	.12	.0946	27
Unloaders.....do.....	.12	.0749	60

<sup>1</sup> 100 inches.

## Wage rates—Continued.

	De- manded.	Our present rate.	Per cent increase.
<b>WHITE PICKLERS.</b>			
Machine man..... per ton.....	.10	.0756	22
Loader..... do.....	.10	.0725	28
Unloader..... do.....	.10	.0725	28
Hot mill polishers..... per hour.....	.73½	.42	75
Black plate laborers..... do.....	.73½	.44	67
Holdup on shears..... do.....	.79½	.47	69
Hookup on annealing floor..... do.....	.80½	.46	75
Firemen on annealing..... do.....	.84	.48½	74
Common labor..... do.....	.73½	.42	75
Cold roll polishers..... do.....	.85	.49	75
Bar shears..... do.....	.78½	.44½	75
Sticker pullers..... do.....	.77½	.45	72
Tin liners..... do.....	.73½	.45	63
Cranemen..... do.....	.84	.48-49½	71
Box house..... do.....	.73½	.44	67
Ash wheelers..... do.....	.73½	.44½	65
Buggy man in tin house..... do.....	.78½	.45	75
Shippers in sorting room..... do.....	.78	.45-49½	73-67
Hookup in shipping department..... do.....	.86½	.49½	75

**LIBERTY LODGE COMMITTEE,**  
**JOSEPH LOWTHER, President.**  
**STEVE VIGNOVITCH, Treasurer.**  
**TOM COLOSINO, Secretary.**

## Wheeling Steel &amp; Iron Co., Wheeling, W. Va.

	Force.	Hours.	Present average full day's pay.
Laborers on cold rolls.....	16	11	\$5.75
Cold roll:			
Roughers and peckers.....	30	11	6.25
Openers.....	32	11	6.00
Grease boys.....	15	11	5.00
Polishers.....	3	11	6.10
Annealers:			
Firemen.....	12	12	6.75
Hook up.....	12	12	6.45
Black picklers:			
Loaders.....	12	12	7.50
Assorters.....	15	12	8.75
Machine men.....	3	12	8.75
White picklers:			
Loaders.....	15	10	7.50
Machine men.....	2	10	7.25
Millwrights.....	7	12	6.30
Hot mill, etc., polishers.....	16	12	5.88
Hold up.....	27	10	5.17
Sticker pullers.....	50	10	5.40
Ash wheelers.....	6	12	6.23
Bar shears.....	10	10	5.00
Black plate.....	7	10	4.85
Cranemen.....	28	12	6.72
Box house.....	17	10	4.85
Tin line.....	45	12	6.30
"Buggy men," tin house.....	20	12	6.30
Shippers.....	20	10	4.95
Hook up, shipping department.....	4	12	6.95
Common labor, all departments.....	80	10	4.82
Hot mill.....	720		
Tinners.....	117		
Sorting room.....	75		
Boiler house, engineers, etc.....	44		
Mechanical, etc.....	55		
Openers.....	48		
Tin house, hour rate, not common labor.....	97		
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,060</b>		

¹ Tonnage and piecework organized.



*Hot mills.*

## SINCE ORGANIZING.

	Production.	Mills.		Production.	Mills.
1917.			1918—Continued.		
April.....	2,817	<sup>1</sup> 18	August.....	5,726	24
May.....	4,282	18	September.....	3,063	18
June.....	5,050	18	October.....	6,064	18
July.....	3,815	18	November.....	4,994	18
August.....	5,498	18	December.....	5,066	18
September.....	6,586	24			
October.....	8,428	24	1919.		
November.....	7,946	24	January.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	.....
December.....	6,210	24	February.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	.....
			March.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	.....
1918.			April.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	.....
January.....	7,072	24	May.....	3,874	12
February.....	4,453	18	June.....	4,332	18
March.....	7,175	24	July.....	4,799	18
April.....	6,680	24	August.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	.....
May.....	5,844	18	September.....	6,548	24
June.....	5,756	24			
July.....	5,286	18			
				<sup>1</sup> 137,368	<sup>2</sup> 406

<sup>1</sup> Strike.<sup>2</sup> Off part of time.<sup>3</sup> Changed from 18 to 24.<sup>4</sup> Gross tonnage.<sup>5</sup> Average gross tonnage per mill per month.

## BEFORE ORGANIZING.

	Production.	Mills.		Production.	Mills.
1915.			1916—Continued.		
January.....	1,558	8	April.....	4,075	12
February.....	1,448	8	May.....	3,862	12
March.....	2,451	10	June.....	3,815	12
April and May.....	6,213	10	July.....	3,032	12
June.....	3,206	10	August.....	4,502	12
July.....	3,064	10	September.....	4,918	18
August.....	3,171	10	October.....	5,832	18
September.....	3,260	10	November.....	5,924	18
October.....	3,707	12	December.....	5,069	18
November.....	3,988	12			
December.....	3,964	12	1917.		
			January.....	5,466	18
1916.			February.....	4,523	18
January.....	3,745	12	March.....	5,997	18
February.....	3,838	12			
March.....	4,465	12		<sup>1</sup> 105,073	<sup>2</sup> 344

<sup>1</sup> Gross tonnage.<sup>2</sup> Average \$36.5 per mill per month.

A mill working at normal capacity will produce 315 gross tons in a 30-day month with four Saturdays and four Sundays.

*New 1919-20 base price, hot mills.*

Gauge.	Roller and rougher.	Doubler.	Heater.	Catcher.	Screw boy.	Shear-men.	Total.
20.....	\$2.48	\$1.46	\$1.62	\$0.95	\$0.62	\$0.33	\$7.46
24.....	2.96	1.81	1.96	1.05	.75	.40	8.96
26.....	3.15	1.91	2.15	1.11	.82	.40	9.54
28.....	3.18	2.01	2.32	1.11	.82	.42	9.86
30.....	3.34	2.28	2.60	1.26	.84	.42	10.74
31.....	3.42	2.41	2.78	1.30	.85	.42	11.18
32.....	3.57	2.54	2.91	1.36	1.87	.44	11.77
33.....	3.81	2.66	3.00	1.43	1.89	.47	12.35
34.....	4.23	2.85	3.28	1.58	1.92	.49	13.44
35.....	4.43	2.99	3.49	1.67	1.96	.51	14.15
36.....	4.78	3.08	3.62	1.78	1.96	.53	14.80
37.....							
38.....	4.84	3.18	3.72	1.83	1.96	.53	15.19

Plus 10 per cent.

*New 1919-20 base price, tin house.*

Large----- \$8.91 | Small----- \$11.55

*Hot-mill scale, July and August, 1919.*

Gauge.	Roller and rougher.	Doublers.	Heaters.	Catchers.	Screw boy.	Shear-men.	Total.
20.....	\$4.17	\$2.45	\$2.72	\$1.60	\$1.04	\$0.55	\$12.53
24.....	5.01	3.04	3.20	1.78	1.26	.67	15.08
26.....	5.29	3.21	3.61	1.86	1.38	.67	16.02
28.....	5.34	3.38	3.90	1.86	1.38	.70	16.56
30.....	5.60	3.81	4.37	2.11	1.39	.72	18.08
31.....	5.74	4.05	4.67	2.18	1.43	.71	18.78
32.....	6.00	4.27	4.89	2.28	1.46	.74	19.64
33.....	6.40	4.47	5.04	2.40	1.50	.79	20.60
34.....	7.11	4.79	5.51	2.65	1.55	.82	22.43
35.....	7.44	5.02	5.86	2.81	1.61	.85	23.60
36.....	7.95	5.17	6.08	2.99	1.61	.89	24.69
38.....	8.13	5.34	6.25	3.07	1.61	.94	25.34

*Tin-house scale, July and August, 1919.*

Large----- 11.94 | Small----- 15.48

September and October the same.

Production runs 89 per cent large, 11 per cent small. Average price, \$12.33. Average time, 70 BB, \$8.63.

*Earnings of typical men in occupations affected by Amalgamated Association scale, last six months of 1918.*

Name.	Number of turns.	Amount.	Average turn.	Name.	Number of turns.	Amount.	Average turn.
<b>ROLLERS.</b>				<b>HEATER'S HELPERS.</b>			
F. A. Moran.....	93	\$1,675.00	\$18.01	G. Hanke.....	98	875.80	8.93
D. H. Webb.....	91	1,648.60	18.11	J. Wisniski.....	79	890.60	11.27
J. S. McBane.....	91	1,829.60	20.10	Alex. Krainski.....	91	952.60	10.46
L. H. McKean.....	86	1,627.25	18.92	Gus Wike.....	76	748.75	9.86
F. Griffith.....	59	1,213.05	20.56	W. Porter.....	43	478.70	11.13
Wm. Suttle.....	84	1,574.75	18.74	C. Hoge.....	96	899.70	9.37
Total.....	504	9,568.25	18.98	Total.....	483	4,846.15	10.03
<b>ROUGHERS.</b>				<b>DOUBLERS.</b>			
E. Schulback.....	69	512.90	7.43	W. Williams.....	89	1,014.60	11.40
David Lewis.....	67	660.75	9.86	Sam Lott.....	93	981.05	10.54
R. W. Evans.....	85	818.65	9.63	F. Panchar.....	57	568.45	9.97
Jas. Moore.....	73	808.95	11.08	Jas. Evans.....	93	934.75	10.05
L. H. Daubert.....	84	956.05	11.38	W. B. Coates.....	75	689.65	9.19
C. Howell.....	84	886.55	10.55	John Bender.....	56	1,034.30	12.02
Total.....	462	4,643.35	10.05	Total.....	493	5,222.80	10.59
<b>HEATERS.</b>				<b>DOUBLER'S HELPERS.</b>			
A. Hanke.....	99	1,236.85	12.49	Lee Birwinkle.....	95	710.65	7.48
O. C. Julian.....	91	1,049.45	11.53	F. Bro "n.....	96	731.80	7.62
John Nagz.....	89	1,223.70	13.74	F. Freeland.....	92	678.20	7.37
John Brooks.....	72	919.65	13.05	W. Trussell.....	53	569.25	10.74
Wm. McNickle.....	87	1,040.25	11.95	W. Boichet.....	80	782.85	9.78
B. Hoge.....	90	973.35	10.82	Joe Siniski.....	85	730.80	8.59
Total.....	528	6,463.25	12.24	Total.....	501	4,203.96	8.39

<sup>1</sup> This is an average of 14 turns per month, \$255.78 per month.

<sup>2</sup> This is an average of 13 turns per month, \$128.98 per month.

<sup>3</sup> This is an average of 14.7 turns per month, \$179.54 per month.

<sup>4</sup> This is an average of 13.4 turns per month, \$134.61 per month.

<sup>5</sup> This is an average of 13.7 turns per month, \$145.08 per month.

<sup>6</sup> This is an average of 13.9 turns per month, \$116.77 per month.

*Earnings of typical men in occupations affected by Amalgamated Association scale, last six months of 1918—Continued.*

Name.	Number of turns.	Amount	Average turn.	Name.	Number of turns.	Amount.	Average turn.
<b>CATCHERS (NET, WITH HELPER'S WAGES<sup>1</sup> DEDUCTED).</b>				<b>SHEARMEN—CON.</b>			
Geo. Stead.....	95	548.45	5.77	N. Beck.....	256	867.50	3.38
F. Blackshue.....	83	663.70	7.99	F. Aberdick.....	270	988.20	3.66
A. Sala.....	84	661.00	7.86	Total.....	1,449	5,334.30	3.68
L. Patella.....	92	766.30	8.32	<b>THREE TURNS (DAYS WORK).</b>			
C. Conkel.....	77	459.90	5.97	W. McMillan.....			11.76
R. Schwender.....	91	661.75	7.27	P. Karoz.....			11.22
Total.....	522	3,760.80	* 7.20	A. Monahan.....			11.43
<b>SCREW BOYS.</b>				J. A. Lawles.....			10.62
A. Dileonardi.....	85	490.85	5.77	N. Beck.....			10.14
H. Gettles.....	97	689.25	7.10	F. Aberdick.....			10.98
W. Wassell.....	93	617.95	6.64	Total.....			* 11.04
F. Vezzani.....	97	650.00	6.79	<b>TIMERS.</b>			
J. Pipolake.....	91	620.50	6.81	A. Yockey.....	94	972.00	10.34
W. Blanco.....	89	581.15	6.52	Jas. Marten.....	91	901.75	9.91
Total.....	552	3,658.70	* 6.63	L. Scarno.....	85	898.65	10.57
<b>SHEARMEN.</b>				H. Meyers.....	79	760.80	9.63
W. McMillan.....	257	1,010.00	3.92	C. French.....	90	863.10	9.59
P. Karoz.....	174	651.90	3.74	G. Howst.....	93	877.80	9.66
A. Monahan.....	269	1,027.15	3.81	M. Falles.....	85	806.11	9.48
J. A. Lawles.....	223	789.55	3.54	Total.....	617	6,080.21	11 9.85

<sup>1</sup> Catcher's helpers, \$2.75 and \$3 per day, flat rate.

\* This is an average of 14.5 turns per month, \$104.46 per month.

\* This is an average of 15.3 turns per month, \$101.6 per month.

\* This is an average of 13.4 days work per month, \$148.14 per month.

\* This is an average of 14.7 turns per month, \$144.77 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. What reason did they give for striking under those circumstances?

Senator McKELLAR. On the 22d of September—we are talking about the tin-plate strikers now.

Mr. SCOTT. They presented a scale here on Tuesday of this week. It was a scale presented by the—I might explain that the arrangement with the Amalgamated Association for the tin-plate plant did not cover all of the workmen in that. This scale was promulgated by the Amalgamated Association, Liberty Lodge, covering the other workmen in this tin-plate plant where we had the contract with us. That was presented on October 7 and they struck on the 9th. This covers about 500 men, and the advance they asked or demanded runs from 27 per cent to 104 per cent over the wages at present being paid.

Senator McKELLAR. What are you paying under the contract?

Mr. SCOTT. For common labor 46 cents an hour, 10 hours.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that more or less than is being paid by the steel company?

Mr. SCOTT. Practically the same.

Senator McKELLAR. I thought that there was 42 cents an hour—

Mr. SCOTT. There was 42 cents an hour for eight hours and time and a half over that.

Senator McKELLAR. And that is the way you figure the 46 cents?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And the scale of the wages is the same——

Mr. SCOTT. The scale of wages is the same; yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You pay 46 cents an hour?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; and he works 10 hours, and they pay 42 cents for the first eight hours and time and a half over that.

The CHAIRMAN. And while this was pending this strike was called?

Mr. SCOTT. This was presented to us on Tuesday of this week, and they struck on Thursday morning.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you refuse to grant the increase demanded?

Mr. SCOTT. No. It was being considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any particular time mentioned for the consideration of this matter?

Mr. SCOTT. No; there was nothing in this; I think Mr. Larkin, the vice president of the association in that district, said we would have another meeting on the coming Tuesday; that is, this coming Tuesday.

Senator McKELLAR. I did not catch that. Where is Mr. Larkin?

Mr. SCOTT. We are in the Wheeling district, and this gentleman with me is from Yorkville, some 6 miles up the river, some 6 miles from Wheeling.

Senator McKELLAR. How many men do you employ?

Mr. SCOTT. Between 4,500 and 5,000.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many do you employ in the tinplate department?

Mr. SCOTT. Eighteen hundred.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a subsidiary company of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. SCOTT. No; we have no connection.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of your men are American citizens?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, that is a little hard to answer——

Senator McKELLAR. Give your best judgment about it.

Mr. SCOTT. I should say about 25 and 75; that is, 25 per cent were foreigners. We have not got as many foreigners as the others.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by foreigners? Do you mean by that the unnaturalized?

Mr. SCOTT. The non-English speaking.

Senator McKELLAR. Seventy-five per cent Americans and 25 per cent foreigners, do you say?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. That is a rather high percentage, isn't it?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Is it not a fact, Mr. Scott, that in the average American industry to-day there are not much more than 50 per cent American citizens—50 per cent American citizens and 50 per cent foreigners?

Mr. SCOTT. I think that is true, but our company is a little different from them here.

Senator WALSH. I say citizens as distinguished from foreigners. I think the percentage is much higher when you come to consider those that speak the English language.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the other mills in that district tied up the same as yours?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir; all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. And what territory do you embrace?

Mr. SCOTT. Starting in with Steubenville, Mingo Junction, Martins Ferry, Bellaire, Wheeling, Benwood—

The CHAIRMAN. How many plants have you that are closed?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, there are the La Belle Iron Works at Steubenville that are closed, and the Carnegie Steel Co. has a plant at Mingo Junction and Bellaire, Ohio, and they are both closed. We have a plant at Yorkville, Ohio, and Martins Ferry, two in the city of Wheeling, and one at Benwood. The National Tube Co. have a tube plant at Benwood.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they all closed?

Mr. SCOTT. They are all closed.

Senator STERLING. And how many workmen do they involve?

Mr. SCOTT. They claim that there are about 15,000 to 18,000 workmen.

Senator STERLING. Are they all independent companies?

Mr. SCOTT. No, no; the Carnegie Steel Co. is a subsidiary of the Corporation and the National Tube Co.

Senator STERLING. And are the rest of them independent?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir; and also the Whittaker Glasson Co. I believe they do have one of their plants in Wheeling running.

Senator STERLING. And you say that about 75 per cent of the workmen employed in your plant are American citizens?

Mr. SCOTT. I say that they are English-speaking citizens.

Senator STERLING. You say that about 75 per cent of the workmen in your plant are English-speaking citizens?

Mr. SCOTT. English-speaking people, yes.

Senator STERLING. Do you know from what localities they come mostly?

Mr. SCOTT. Do you mean the foreigners?

Senator STERLING. No; I mean your own American workmen.

Mr. SCOTT. The Benwood plant has been a manufacturing plant for a great many years—

Senator MCKELLAR. Has there been any very great difficulty there?

Mr. SCOTT. No; no difficulty. I do not imagine that we have—not over a half a dozen all told.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Scott, have you at any time discriminated against union men?

Mr. SCOTT. We have not.

Senator PHIPPS. Have any of your foremen been known to discharge a man because he joined the union?

Mr. SCOTT. No; that demand was made by Mr. Tighe at this conference we had on the 20th of September.

Senator PHIPPS. And that conference with the Amalgamated Association was supposed to remain in force from the 1st of last July to the 30th of next June, inclusive; is that true?

Mr. SCOTT. That is true.

Senator PHIPPS. And this demand is for the introduction of a new scale involving an increase in the rates; is that right?

Mr. SCOTT. Not all the ones covered by the contract scale, but these other men that have been taken into the Amalgamated Association since that conference at Atlantic City, or wherever we made our agreement. There is here an agreement in our conference with the Amalgamated Association on that point. It says that if other crafts in the company employed by us are organized into the association during the year, and they make demands that the company can not meet, then those crafts shall remain over and be taken up at the next succeeding year's scale.

That was put in there for the purpose of protecting our contract. It was known that other people might come in during the year to go into the association, and we could not be put into the position of having them break our contract because they would not submit to the demands of other people in the lodge.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, Mr. Scott, we would like to be given information about this strike or walkout on September 26. Does that affect men who were not covered by this contract?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And were they included—

Mr. SCOTT. No men outside of the contract—

Senator PHIPPS (interrupting). No men outside of the contract walked out September 22?

Mr. SCOTT. Walked out on September 22.

Senator PHIPPS. They walked out on October 9, and that walkout involves the additional men who have since been organized; is that right?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Into the Amalgamated Association and they are now members of the Amalgamated Association?

Mr. SCOTT. That is true.

Senator PHIPPS. With whom you have no scale, and with whom under the agreement, they were supposed to hold over until July 1 of next year before a scale would be made with them?

Mr. SCOTT. That is true, Senator.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, in addition to those men who were demanding a new scale, and whom you believe should wait until the 1st of next July, you have a contingent that I mentioned covered by the existing agreement?

Mr. SCOTT. That is true.

Senator PHIPPS. And did they walk out at the same time?

Mr. SCOTT. Absolutely.

Senator PHIPPS. Supporting the demand of the men who desired this new scale?

Mr. SCOTT. True.

Senator PHIPPS. And which you claim is in violation of your contract?

Mr. SCOTT. Absolutely; yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And what reasons do they assign for the strike?

Mr. SCOTT. They want an increase in wages running from 27 per cent to 104 per cent over the present scale. I would like to put in, while we are on this matter of closed and open shop—I would like to submit this, if you will bear with me. This tin mill we speak of was put in operation in December, 1913, as an open mill. We ran it as such up until March of 1917, and under stress of the war and

the pressing need of the Government for plates we were compelled to submit to the demands of the Amalgamated Association, and we became unionized in this one plant. From the time we started the plant until the time it was unionized our average production per mill per month was 305.5 gross tons. Since that date the average is 276 gross tons, showing a loss of 10 per cent.

Senator STERLING. Do you mean it shows a loss of 10 per cent since the unionization?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir; since we have been unionized.

Senator WALSH. Do I understand that the men of the union, with whom you had a contract, struck in sympathy because you did not at once yield to the demands of the men who were newly organized?

Mr. SCOTT. Senator, we took that up; we took up the case. This was presented to us on Tuesday, and we were to give them an answer the following Tuesday, and they all went out on the morning—

Senator WALSH (interrupting). The newly organized group that presented the demand and the union men with whom you had a contract?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How many men were employed after that closed shop became unionized as compared with before?

Mr. SCOTT. Our plant had been increased, so that the number of men employed would not have any bearing. We figured on the average ton per mill per month, so it cost us an average—

Senator STERLING. You think as the result of unionizing that there was this decrease in production?

Mr. SCOTT. There is no question in my mind about it.

Senator WALSH. Were the hours shortened after the unions were organized?

Mr. SCOTT. No; we were practically along the same hours.

Senator WALSH. And the explanation you make is that the men, when they became unionized, were less zealous about the performance of their work, or insisted upon conditions that resulted in making the production less?

Mr. SCOTT. They have a rule in the association that provides—say that it takes nine men for a crew on a mill. If there is a man short, it will not start; and if a man can not be found to take the place of the vacant man, or the missing man, they will wait two hours, and then, if the man is not there, they will all go home, and we will lose that work. That is largely due—to this is largely due this loss of tonnage. Under the old order of things we would put in a man or we would work short handed.

There is another thing that I would like to submit, and it is an article which appeared in the Wheeling paper under date of September 4, written by a member of the Amalgamated Association—it states so here—which outlines the plan exactly as they have followed it closing our mill down.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was it written by?

Mr. SCOTT. It is written by Bob Edwards, a member of the Amalgamated Association.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is he?

Mr. SCOTT. He is an organizer for the Amalgamated Association. He outlines in this article the plan they have followed in order to make the strike effective, and they have followed it exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. What date is that?

Mr. SCOTT. September 4.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose we will have to let it go in. Is it a long article?

Mr. SCOTT. It is rather long. He is rather long-winded, you know. It is about two columns.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it go in. That is all.

(The article above referred to is here printed in full in the record, as follows:)

#### HOW TO WIN A STRIKE.

[By Bob Edwards, of Martins Ferry, member Amalgamated Association.]

Now that the steel workers of the United States are on the verge of a tremendous struggle, a strike that will decide for the coming years whether the steel workers are to remain wage slaves or freemen, it behooves every worker who has the welfare of his class at heart to devote the entire powers of his mind and intellect to study and devise a means, a strategic plan, by which the forces of labor can win the contest with the consequent defeat and demoralization and, we hope, the utter destruction of the enemies' powers of resistance. A strike of workers in this period is an actual declaration of war between the proletariat (the workers) and the capitalist; between a system of cooperation and a system of exploitation; between right and wrong; between humanity and brutality; in short, between all that is noble and elevating and that which is debasing and low. A strike is war, because all the horrors of the battle field are repeated in a strike—men killed, homes disrupted, noble and conscientious workers put on the list of tramps and undesirable citizens. Why? Because the workers, following out the aspirations of their souls, fought for a better world to live in, where all (even the capitalist) may live in contentment and harmony.

A strike, then, is war, and war recognizes one end—the imposition of the will of the conqueror upon that of the vanquished. To do this properly we must so manipulate and direct our forces that the offensive must immediately be taken, so that the struggle will be short but strenuous. No conflict was ever won by defensive tactics. Take the battle into his city, his household if necessary, and never cry quits until the strike is won. Before entering the battle it is well to look at ourselves and question, Are we ready for this supreme and, we hope, final struggle between capital and labor? Are our commands well organized, fully equipped, and, above all, have the members the esprit du corps that is essential to win? And, last but not least, have the workers the proper leadership, without which quality numbers and equipment count for little? Are the reins in the hands of men whose nerves are steady and strong? The answer to this last will determine whose shall be the victory.

In numbers we have enough, if they are used intelligently and with judgment. When we have 400,000 men, use them all and not a fractional part of them, as was done in the 1909-10 strike. To use a part (and by so doing sacrifice them) is a blunder, a crime, and unworthy the noble cause for which the workers are about to enter and which all are ready and willing to give their all in one more attempt to shatter the shackles of the exploiter.

#### ESPRIT DU CORPS NEVER FINER.

The esprit du corps of the workers was never in finer shape. Like an athlete who has been properly and carefully trained, labor is anxious to begin. He is tearing even now at his leashes, and it takes great self-control to hold him. In leadership we are weak. In a terrific struggle like the oncoming one we need captains of iron and steel. The present doesn't require a Napoleon or a genius of like qualifications, but simply a man or men with very ordinary common sense but unlimited courage. It's a notorious fact that present-day labor leaders are better politicians than class-conscious soldiers; better parliamentarians than fighters; better adapted to the warmth of the fireside than the picket line, preferring to give the glad hand than the fist. This quality of leadership is the weakness of the labor movement, and the members are as much to blame and are as guilty as any. Basil M. Manly writes:



"In 1909 an attempt was made to rebuild the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, but through the vacillating policy of the leaders and the ruthless power of the Steel Corporation the strike was crushed, and the last vestige of organization in the mills of the United States Steel Corporation and the leading independent steel companies was eliminated."

This criticism was caused by the irresolution and lack of foresight in our national officials failing to use the organized forces at their command during the great although disastrous strike against the Steel Trust.

Will we repeat in the present struggle the tragic blunders of the past?

History is the one infallible teacher. Like a loving mother, it points out the pitfalls and warns us from stumbling over unseen obstacles. Although it advises and counsels in a friendly manner, yet its laws are inexorable and if we disregard the information given, like an avenging fury it tears us to pieces.

In the 1909-10 strike permission was given the union men of the independent plants to continue working and by so doing supply the market with commodities which the strike was called to prevent. The men on strike knew that as long as the market was kept full the strike was futile. So in the present strike, if the union men are forced to work by our officials, then the market will be supplied and the strike lost. To win a strike keep your commodity off the market. By this foolish and disastrous policy of allowing one part to strike and the other to work is like a tug-of-war where all our enemies are expended against each other and the capitalist laughs in his sleeves to see such sport. Following out this failure, not through the efforts of the steel magnates, but by our own brothers with union cards, and by that act becoming that worse thing of all, a union scab.

#### SHALL TRAGEDY BE REPEATED?

Shall we repeat this tragedy and throw unionism back a generation? By no means. Call out the independent plants as well. Let every local go on record (it is their duty) that belongs to the independent company, as showing their willingness to lay down their tools at the call of the national executive board. By this act you will show the enemy the solidarity of the workers and put the fear of man of man (they have no fear of God) in their hearts. Do this immediately. Delay will be fatal. Show the world for once a clear case of class-conscious action. For the independent plants to work and supply the market with goods is to betray our brothers on the firing line who are manfully fighting the most colossal combination of wealth and unscrupulousness the world ever saw. If the men in independent plants don't willingly come to the striker's assistance, then the locals on strike should force them out or recognize them for what they are, Judases. War or a strike of workers is analogous to club law, or the law of the strongest. If the sentiment of brotherhood were universally diffused and practiced, and a system of international morality established and fully accepted, there would be no need of war or strikes. As it is, brotherhood is in the background, and the merry war of clubs goes on. The one with the biggest club wins.

As a maxim of military science that to win a war is to destroy the enemy's organized forces. At present (although the capitalist employ such means) labor does not use machine guns, rifles, and clubs to destroy the enemy's forces, consequently other means must be resorted to. What are the organized forces of capitalism? What are their sinews of war? It's not men. Labor has practically all these. Then it must be some other quantity.

Capitalism is based on the exploitation of the wage earners. It is a system of society in which the greater part of production is carried on by employers who use the accumulated stock of wealth to acquire machinery and raw material and to hire labor to produce goods for sale and profit. Therefore, as long as the capitalist can hire labor his stock of wealth continually increases. The sinews of war of the capitalist is this stock of wealth. This is the organized forces of the enemy. These must either be destroyed or change their ownership. When this is done, the host of labor will be victorious.

There is another plan which is not practicable and is to permit this stock of wealth to gradually eat itself up by taxes, overhead expense, and dividends. We will not consider this, as too much time is required.

## HOW TO WIN.

It has been stated that the capitalist stock of wealth increases in direct proportion to the number of workers employed, and decreases in like ratio when the number grows less, and disappears entirely when work ceases. Therefore to destroy the capitalist sinews of war, his organized forces, is simply to lay down your tools, refuse to work, and the strike is won. But to do this effectively, necessitates the total cessation of work of all union men in the industry affected. Not alone in the plants of the Steel Corporation, but all steel plants of the country. By this means the steel industry is completely paralyzed, which is the end desired by all strikes.

Second plan is to change the ownership of the means of producing the stock of wealth of the capitalist. This plan is the most reasonable and logical that can be adopted and will do away with and eliminate the hardships, brutalities, and killing that is incident and inevitable in all strikes and particularly so in the coming struggle.

If the representatives of the United States Government do not see fit to take over the steel industry and control and use it for the benefit of the people, then let them keep hands off the coming struggle and be an impartial observer of the conflict. If the manufacturers use peaceful means the workers will act accordingly. Should the moneyed power resort to machine guns, gas bombs as intimidated, rifles, etc., then the workers will defend their rights as American citizens and rely upon the following code of international law:

When a community is in a state of anarchy, the individual man must take the law into his own hands, and defend his life and his rights with violence, if need be.

When armed thugs and strikebreakers are imported into a community that community is in a state of anarchy and every individual is fully empowered to take up arms and defend his life and rights. Now, we have arrived at the following strategical plan. First, a general assault along the whole line with every union man participating. Second, the destruction of the sinews of war of the enemy and as a tactical maneuver the selling of every single share of stock that the union man and his friends may possess in any steel corporation. This is one of the most effective weapons labor has. Third, the taking over by the Government of the steel industry and its democratic control and use for the people.

Another military maxim is, "Guard against the plans of the enemy." A good general is like a good checker player, always trying to anticipate the moves of his opponent. The chief proposition for the capitalists is to operate the plants, and continue them in operation so that they can enlarge, if possible, their stock of wealth and starve the strikers into submission. Where will they secure the necessary hands? They will not advertise for men with the qualifications, "Poles, Syrians, and Rumanians preferred," as they blundered in 1909. The capitalist is intelligent and resourceful and will not tempt fate in the same way. His eyes are cast to the sunny South and even now the tramp, tramp of the black man is heard as the exodus nears the turbulent clime of the North. A few short years ago the tramp, tramp was South by the white for the liberation of the slave. Now, the hordes of the blacks are on their way North for the enslavement of the whites. Ugh, this stinks, let's quit.

## TESTIMONY OF MATT O'REILLY.

(Matt O'Reilly was then called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Give your name to the reporter.

Mr. O'REILLY. Matt O'Reilly.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live?

Mr. O'REILLY. Denora, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a steel plant there?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Whose steel plant is it?

Mr. O'REILLY. It is the steel plant of the American Steel & Wire Co.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had no evidence from that part of the

country, and we would like to hear from you. Are you working in the steel mill there?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir; I am an assistant roller in the rod department.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been there?

Mr. O'REILLY. Fourteen years.

The CHAIRMAN. And are you an American citizen?

Mr. O'REILLY. I am an American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. And where were you born? Were you born here?

Mr. O'REILLY. I was born here; born in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. During the time you worked there, tell us something about the wages.

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, our grievance to-day is not so much about the wages, as it is the working conditions and the hours and the right of free speech.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you go out on the strike?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed in that mill?

Mr. O'REILLY. Between 4,000 to 4,500.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many are there out on the strike?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, I should judge there are about 4,200 out on the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us anything about the proportion of foreigners who are out on the strike?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, in our town, I would say they are about 85 per cent foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. And among the workers in the mill?

Mr. O'REILLY. Among the workers in the mill, while I worked, the department that I worked in, they employ about 2,400 men, and they have 581 English-speaking fellows on the pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. And all the rest are foreigners?

Mr. O'REILLY. All the rest are foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. How large a town is it, Mr. O'Reilly.

Mr. O'REILLY. It is 18,000 population.

The CHAIRMAN. You are speaking of mills that you worked in; how about the rest?

Mr. O'REILLY. It will compare, I think, just about the same. We have three departments under the same conditions. They have the steel works and the blast furnace and the rod and steel works, and 582 out of 2,000 steel workers are Americans. They do not classify the foreign people Americans in our town.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of those have become naturalized?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, I should judge there is 70 per cent of them naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. Seventy per cent of them are naturalized?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you say that only about 300 are working in that plant now?

Mr. O'REILLY. There are about 300 working there now.

Senator STERLING. What is the nationality of the foreign element out there?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, Slavs and Russians and Italians—

The CHAIRMAN. Are there many Russians?

Mr. O'REILLY. No; there are not so many Russians.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the Slovaks?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes; we have the Slovaks.

The CHAIRMAN. Of all those foreign nationalities, which of them predominate?

Mr. O'REILLY. The Slavish.

The CHAIRMAN. When you went out on this strike——

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir; the Slavish.

The CHAIRMAN. When you went out on this strike, what were you earning at the time you went out on the strike?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, my average would run about \$16 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. It would run about \$16 a day?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a married man?

Mr. O'REILLY. No, sir; I am a single man.

The CHAIRMAN. You are single?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, \$16 a day; why did you strike?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, my hours are too long and we want better conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. What hours do you work?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, I work from 6 to 6, 12 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Twelve hours, and how many days in the week?

Mr. O'REILLY. Six days.

The CHAIRMAN. You only work six days?

Mr. O'REILLY. We do not operate on Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN. Your complaint is, then, that the hours are too long?

Mr. O'REILLY. My complaint is long hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything else?

Mr. O'REILLY. That is one complaint that we have, and also the working conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you satisfied with the rate of wages you are receiving?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes; I was truly satisfied with the same rate of wages.

The CHAIRMAN. That is nearly as much as a United States Senator gets.

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, but I work longer.

The CHAIRMAN. I doubt that. Maybe you work harder. What about the complaints? What complaints have you had? Have you any fault to find with getting the complaints to those officers above you?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, Mr. Chairman, we can not get any complaint past our foreman. If we have any grievance and take it to the foreman, that is as far as we can go. If we go to the general superintendent, he calls the foreman in, and he will make it so uncomfortable for us in there that we will have to quit.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen that worked out?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir; it has been worked out on me personally.

The CHAIRMAN. When was it worked out on you personally?

Mr. O'REILLY. Two years ago this month.

The CHAIRMAN. And you went back to work?

Mr. O'REILLY. I left and went to different works of the United States Steel Corporation, looking for a job, and I had to go back.

Senator MCKELLAR. What reason did they give you for not employing you?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, they just would not hire me. You know I only followed up the rod work, and I would go to the different rod mills of the United States Steel Corporation and the American Steel & Wire—

Senator STERLING (interrupting). Did they say that they had sufficient help?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir; they said that they had sufficient help.

Senator STERLING. And how long have you been working in that mill?

Mr. O'REILLY. Fourteen years.

Senator STERLING. And how long have you been earning \$16 a day?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, since that last increase.

Senator MCKELLAR. Were you in the Army?

Mr. O'REILLY. No, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. Why was it that you were not in the Army?

Mr. O'REILLY. I was past the draft age.

Senator MCKELLAR. How old are you?

Mr. O'REILLY. Thirty-nine.

Senator MCKELLAR. And that was before the draft age was extended—

Mr. O'REILLY. It was within the second draft, but I was never taken.

Senator MCKELLAR. Had you ever been notified and did you make claim for exemption?

Mr. O'REILLY. No; I never made any claim for exemption.

Senator MCKELLAR. They just passed you by?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So you say that your complaint is about getting your complaints to the officers?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In the department you work in?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, it runs through the whole works. It is not just in the department I work in, but through the whole works.

The CHAIRMAN. How much of the work is organized?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, we are organized about 98 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Ninety-eight per cent?

Mr. O'REILLY. Ninety-eight per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that true before the strike?

Mr. O'REILLY. That was true before the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Could not you get your complaint through the committees of the union?

Mr. O'REILLY. They won't recognize a committee. We could not send a committee.

Senator MCKELLAR. What would they say when you would take a complaint to them? I consider that this is a very serious matter. A man ought to have an avenue for his complaint to those who control the mill. I would like to have you explain just how that is. How did they treat you?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, the only avenue we have, we have to take our grievances to our foreman, and the foreman will tell you that he will take it up with the superintendent, and we wait for weeks and we do not hear anything about it. If you go to see the superintendent, he will come back at the foreman and ask him about such a thing, and they will pass it off, and then the foreman gets back on the individual.

Senator McKELLAR. He penalizes you for having gone over his head?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. After you had appealed to him first?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes; after I had appealed to him first, but take it on further and he will work on us for that.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, when that will happen, just tell us exactly the method. Take the case of two years ago. What was the trouble? What did you try to get to the mill authorities?

Mr. O'REILLY. I tried to get away from some of the abuses of my foreman.

Senator McKELLAR. He was abusive to you, was he?

Mr. O'REILLY. He was abusive to me and to everybody, and I could not stand it any longer, and I took it to the superintendent, and that was the end of it.

Senator McKELLAR. What did he say to you after he found out that you had carried it to the superintendent?

Mr. O'REILLY. He told me that I would have to come back there and work if I wanted to work for the company.

Senator McKELLAR. How many men were there under this foreman?

Mr. O'REILLY. About 400 men.

Senator McKELLAR. About 400?

Mr. O'REILLY. 400.

Senator STERLING. You did not take it up again with the foreman himself?

Mr. O'REILLY. I had to come back to him to go to work.

Senator STERLING. Did you submit your complaint to the superintendent of the abuses heaped upon you by the foreman, through the foreman?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir; through the foreman.

Senator STERLING. What did the foreman say?

Mr. O'REILLY. That is why I got so much abuse from the foreman, that was why I took it up with the superintendent.

Senator STERLING. But, in the first instance, was the complaint to the superintendent of some abuse by the foreman?

Mr. O'REILLY. No; the complaint I made directly to the foreman.

Senator STERLING. Well, what did you complain of?

Mr. O'REILLY. That I wouldn't stand that any more, that abuse; I am an American. I left the employ of the company, and when I went to work again for the company I had to come back to that same foreman. That is the man I am working for to-day.

Senator STERLING. Did you expect that foreman, of whom you had complained, to transmit your complaint to the superintendent?

Mr. O'REILLY. When I come back I took it up through the superintendent, when I found out exactly how everything stood, that I

could not work anywhere else. I had to come back there in order to go to work, and I went up and saw the superintendent.

Senator STERLING. How long were you absent from your work?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, I was absent three months. He told me to go and talk to the foreman and go back in there and work and everything will be all right, and since that time I never had any trouble with the foreman.

Senator STERLING. You went back, and since that time you never had any trouble with the foreman?

Mr. O'REILLY. I went back, and since that time I never had any trouble with the foreman, but I had to go to the superintendent.

Senator STERLING. And in all of your years of work that is the only trouble you had?

Mr. O'REILLY. That is the only trouble I had.

Senator PHIPPS. And in this case you had—you did get a hearing from the superintendent, didn't you?

Mr. O'REILLY. I got a hearing from the superintendent; I made it my business to get a hearing.

Senator MCKELLAR. You seem to be an unusually intelligent man, to me, and you are making \$16 a day, which, to some of us, seems to be quiet a good salary. Would you mind explaining to us the circumstances or the causes that led you to quit a place paying you \$16 a day, voluntarily?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. Please give it.

Mr. O'REILLY. The money is not worth \$16 a day—\$16 a day is not worth the hours that I put in to get it on a man's health and condition of life inside of one of those mills.

Senator MCKELLAR. Then the real reason of it is that you do not feel that you are equal to the work physically; is that the reason?

Mr. O'REILLY. That is my reason for wanting the eight-hour day.

Senator MCKELLAR. And you think that you could stand it for 8 hours, but that you could not stand it for 12 hours?

Mr. O'REILLY. I could stand it for 8 hours but can't stand it for 12 hours.

Senator MCKELLAR. That is the idea?

Mr. O'REILLY. That is the idea.

The CHAIRMAN. And even 8 hours with less money?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir; even 8 hours with less money.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that the money consideration is not the complaint, is not the principal thing?

Mr. O'REILLY. Not in our line of occupation.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are not complaining of that?

Mr. O'REILLY. I am not complaining of that.

Senator STERLING. Describe the nature of your work. We would like to know just what physical exertion is required to do the work.

Mr. O'REILLY. My particular line of work, I have this set of rolls to take care of. We are over the rods that are running through there from 6 o'clock in the morning—hot iron is going through those rolls for 11 hours there, except 1 hour. I have to adjust those rolls to keep the iron down, and to catch onto those rolls—

Senator STERLING. Is not that done by machinery?

Mr. O'REILLY. No; it is done by hand.

Senator STERLING. You have a long—

Mr. O'REILLY. The adjustment of the rolls is done by hand with wrenches.

Senator STERLING. There is no heavy lifting, is there?

Mr. O'REILLY. Heavy lifting? I have to pull on a wrench and pull that across—

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). And about how much is that temperature—what is the temperature of that iron?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, I could not say what temperature it is. We roll at all temperatures.

Senator McKELLAR. I suppose you get used to it and you do not mind it?

Mr. O'REILLY. It is according to the grade of steel. You do not roll all steel at the same temperature.

Senator PHIPPS. Perhaps it will enlighten the Senators to make a few comparisons. Are the conditions in the rod mills about the same as they are in the pipe mills?

Mr. O'REILLY. No; the conditions are altogether different, Senator. All the rods in the rod mills are all handled by hand, with wrenches. The men working on the rolls have to catch these rods coming out of one set of rolls and turn them over and under.

Senator PHIPPS. And that is a part of your labor?

Mr. O'REILLY. Mine is the adjusting of the rolls.

Senator McKELLAR. And you are working on the rolls, using the tongs as you described?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes.

Senator STERLING. What do the men get there?

Mr. O'REILLY. There is about \$2.50 difference. I may be wrong; about \$2.50, I guess.

Senator STERLING. Yours is about \$2.50 more?

Mr. O'REILLY. About \$2.50 more.

Senator STERLING. They get \$13.50 and you get \$16?

Mr. O'REILLY. We get tonnage, according to how many tons; what we make.

The CHAIRMAN. Your objection is on the question of presenting complaints, is it?

Mr. O'REILLY. We do not have any avenue for any complaints whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. First, it is the question of presenting complaints; is that right?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And second is the eight-hour day?

Mr. O'REILLY. The eight-hour day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, there is the danger of it that we could complain of.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to get down your complaints. Those are two of your complaints?

Mr. O'REILLY. Those are my two complaints.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything else?

Mr. O'REILLY. And this time and a half, you know. It is figured that we get paid the tonnage pay and time and a half for all over eight hours, but we don't; we get paid by the ton. We get time and a half for one-third of the 12 hours' work.



The CHAIRMAN. For instance, those are your complaints. Is there anything in the recognition of the union? Do you demand that? Is it one of those demands?

Mr. O'REILLY. One of the demands is the recognition of organized labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand now that you can not get your complaints through?

Mr. O'REILLY. We can not get our complaints through without any detriment to the individual.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, in regard to the eight-hour day. If you had your eight-hour day, would you go back to work?

Mr. O'REILLY. If we got the eight hours and recognition of the union.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, in the matter of the wages; take your own case; what wages do you think would be fair, working 8 hours a day instead of 11 or 12?

Mr. O'REILLY. In my own position, Senator?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; what do you think would be the right adjustment?

Mr. O'REILLY. Well, I think the right adjustment—at the present time we are getting, it would average me about \$12 a day.

Senator McKELLAR. And would you be satisfied to take it on that basis?

Mr. O'REILLY. Perfectly satisfied, having it on that basis.

Senator McKELLAR. And you would rather have it on that basis than your present wages?

Mr. O'REILLY. I would rather have it than my present wages.

Senator McKELLAR. And working 12 hours?

Mr. O'REILLY. And working 12 hours.

Senator STERLING. There was no interference with the organizing of the union in your shop, was there?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You said that 98 per cent of the men were union men?

Mr. O'REILLY. We do not have the right of collective bargaining or anything.

Senator STERLING. I mean the organizing of the unions yourselves. There was no discrimination as against the individual union men?

Mr. O'REILLY. If it was known they were discharged out of the plant.

Senator STERLING. But 98 per cent of the men were union men?

Mr. O'REILLY. Ninety-eight of the men were union men, but we got the organization there before they knew it.

Senator STERLING. When did the 98 per cent organize?

Mr. O'REILLY. They have been organized up there since last year.

Senator STERLING. Since last year?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Prior to the beginning of last year, they were letting the union men in the shop—

Mr. O'REILLY. There were no union men there at all.

Senator STERLING. There were no union men there at all?

Mr. O'REILLY. We did not have a union man working in the shop; if it was known they would have fired them out.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you say as to the meetings in this town? Did they allow meetings in the town?

Mr. O'REILLY. We have our local organization meetings. That is the rod and mill department—we can hold their meetings once a week in a hall, but we would not have a mass meeting where all the fellows can get together.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been done to teach English to these non-English-speaking men and women?

Mr. O'REILLY. The only possible chance they have to learn any English is from the English-speaking workmen in there.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you any schools in that town—night schools?

Mr. O'REILLY. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Neither in the plant or outside—the public authorities?

Mr. O'REILLY. The authorities have a night school, but they would not take the trouble to try to teach any of the foreigners.

Senator McKELLAR. If they were citizens they would have a right to go to the school, wouldn't they?

Mr. O'REILLY. They would not have enough teachers to handle them.

Senator STERLING. Have there been any requests made of the company to help in the matter of night schools that you know of?

Mr. O'REILLY. Not as I know of.

Senator STERLING. Did it occur to you that the company might assist in establishing night schools for the foreigners, so that they could learn English?

Mr. O'REILLY. If they had any way to get to the company—

Senator STERLING. Haven't you known of the company assisting at other plants in the way of night schools, providing night schools for them?

Mr. O'REILLY. I do not know, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. You have attended school?

Mr. O'REILLY. Oh, yes; I have attended school.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a high-school graduate?

Mr. O'REILLY. No, sir; I never got that far.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think it would be a tremendous advantage, both to the men and to the companies and to the community, if these foreigners, especially the younger element of them, should be taught English and be taught the beauties of becoming American citizens?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes, I think, Senator, it would be of great advantage.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you ever, seeing that you are such a sprightly man—a sprightly minded man—has it ever occurred to you to start a movement of that kind for the education and the Americanization of these men there, your fellow employees? Don't you think it would be a splendid thing if such a movement were started?

Mr. O'REILLY. It would be a good thing, a movement of that kind, but the only avenue we have is to try to teach and to talk to those foreigners in the mill, and when you work 12 hours a day you do not have much time to enter into such a movement.

Senator STERLING. Do you think that the superintendent would have put you out if you had gone to see him about a matter of this kind?

Mr. O'REILLY. How much time would we have working that time?

The CHAIRMAN. Would you indorse that kind of a movement? Do you think that the men would like to see the English language taught out there?

Mr. O'REILLY. Yes; and if we could have that started, they would not have room to house the night school.

#### TESTIMONY OF PETER P. WALSH.

(Peter P. Walsh was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. WALSH. Police commissioner in the city of Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the duties of the police commissioner?

Mr. WALSH. I take charge of what is known as the fifth police district, on the South Side of the city of Pittsburgh, taking from—

Senator PHIPPS (interposing). Having charge of that bureau, who come under your jurisdiction?

Mr. WALSH. All the police officers in that district.

Senator PHIPPS. What have you to do with the magistrates, aldermen, or police judges, whatever they may be termed?

Mr. WALSH. The magistrates come under the department of the mayor.

Senator PHIPPS. And you, of course, have no control over the police magistrates?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And you are supposed to see that in the case of arrest that the officer formally presents charges against the person arrested. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, the officers under the city ordinance, what are their powers of arrest?

Mr. WALSH. They can arrest either on view or on a warrant.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, in the first case, on view, what would that be comprised of?

Mr. WALSH. Where they would see one man or two men engaged in a fight on the street, they could come along and arrest them on view, if there is disorderly conduct.

Senator PHIPPS. Suppose they were not fighting, but were congregated on the streets in a group or prowling, would the officer have the right to disperse them or to arrest them?

Mr. WALSH. He would disperse them, and if they refused to move he could lock them up and keep them as loiterers.

Senator PHIPPS. What are the charges that come under the arrest on view?

Mr. WALSH. Disorderly conduct, suspicious persons, and violating the city ordinances.

Senator PHIPPS. Let us understand about suspicious persons. What would he consider sufficient on which to arrest a man as being a suspicious person?

Mr. WALSH. Well, if he would run against a man who was not known in the district—in the district where he would apprehend him—an entire stranger there, and if he could not give a reasonable account of himself, what he was doing, he would charge him as being a suspicious person.

Senator PHIPPS. Suppose an officer's attention was called to the performance of a stranger by other persons, say that they were not fighting, but say that he was stopping people on the street, interviewing or threatening them, would that be sufficient cause for arrest without taking out a warrant?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. It would?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And when a man is taken in arrest he is taken to the police headquarters; is he taken to the nearest one or to the one to which the officer reports?

Mr. WALSH. He is taken to the nearest police station.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the method of procedure there?

Mr. WALSH. He is brought in in the wagon and the wagon man is given the charge and he in turn gives it to the sergeant in the police station and the sergeant takes a report of the case, the man's name, his address, married or single, what nationality, what occupation, whether he can read and write, and enters it upon the blotter, and the charge.

Senator PHIPPS. And the charge?

Mr. WALSH. And the charge.

Senator PHIPPS. That is known as the blotter?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And it is practically a calendar or a docket?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How soon after the hearing—how soon after the arrest will the person be given his hearing?

Mr. WALSH. The magistrate holds the hearing in the morning at 8 o'clock.

Senator PHIPPS. And the men who are arrested the night before, say around midnight, would they have an opportunity to furnish bail so as to avoid spending the night in jail?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes; only in the case of suspicion. A man for disorderly conduct or violating the city ordinance or loitering he could get out on \$15 forfeit and violating the city ordinance or disorderly conduct on \$30 forfeit for his appearance at the hearing in the morning.

Senator PHIPPS. Tell us what the method of the procedure is.

Mr. WALSH. If the charge were disorderly conduct, the officer and prisoner are sworn. The magistrate asks the officer to make his statement. The officer testifies to what he arrested him for and what he was doing, and the judge in turn interrogates the prisoner and asks him what he has to say to the officer's statement, whether true or not true. In the majority of the cases they say that they have nothing to say.

Senator PHIPPS. You think that is the rule; they make no defense?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. In a case where a prisoner asks for counsel, asks for an attorney to question the officer and examine him—is that permitted by the magistrate?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; if a man wants an attorney, the instructions to the sergeant from myself—would ask for a certain attorney—call them up and tell him to come over or ask if he wants to defend him.

Senator PHIPPS. At what hour in the morning are the hearings?

Mr. WALSH. Eight o'clock, Saturdays, maybe sometimes, 10 or after.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that practice of setting the hour at 8 o'clock, the usual hour, changed recently in one of the magistrate's courts to 7 o'clock?

Mr. WALSH. No; no, sir; not that I know of.

Senator PHIPPS. Would you know it if such a change was made?

Mr. WALSH. I would if it was in my district.

Senator PHIPPS. Is Magistrate Suttrop in the fifth police district?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not know of his having held hearings within the last few months at 7 o'clock in the morning instead of 8 o'clock?

Mr. WALSH. In the summer months, in August, he held a 7 o'clock hearing on Sunday morning, when he was going to camp or up to the lakes.

Senator PHIPPS. You are aware of that exception to the rule?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. On a Sunday morning?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Did he have any prisoners at that time who asked to have counsel brought for them?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Would you have known it had there been requests for counsel?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; I would.

Senator PHIPPS. You were present at that hearing on this Sunday morning at 7 o'clock?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did the defendant have notice of the change?

Mr. WALSH. Some of them had been out on forfeit, and the party who came and put up the forfeit, the prisoner would be notified that the hearing will be 7 o'clock instead of 8, and would be heard at that time.

Senator McKELIAR. It has been testified at this hearing that even when a person charged with being a suspicious person had lawyers to represent him, that the judge of the court would not permit the lawyer to examine him, to examine the witness in his behalf, and that he was promptly given "ten or ten" or "ten and ten," without the benefit of a lawyer or counsel or anything else. How is that?

Mr. WALSH. Well, in the last three weeks there have been three different attorneys there. Perhaps I could enlighten you if I knew which one said he was refused. That man Sypniewski? Was that the man?

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I can state about him?

Senator PHIPPS. Will you state about that case?

Mr. WALSH. I can state that specific case; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Go ahead.

Mr. WALSH. He came over there in the morning and he said, "I am to represent some of these men, judge," He said, "Who?" He said, "I do not know. I want to go into the cell room." I said, "How do you know who you represent if you have not got his name?" "Well," he said, "he was arrested." I said, "Give me his name. There are seven men back there; and give me the name, and whatever man you are representing I will bring him out." He could not tell. I said, "Wait until the hearing begins, and if you can recognize him and he asks you to be his counsel, point him out and you can defend him."

The CHAIRMAN. Did not you know that he was employed by the American Federation of Labor to represent its men who had been arrested there?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir. He did not make that known. The hearing began and there was one man that came up—there were four men who were arrested and charged with being suspicious persons. They were arrested in an alleyway up near Thirtieth Street, around 5 o'clock, where there had been several complaints of men being attacked going to work. Those four men came down, and I asked him is any one of these four men the man you represent? He pointed out a man, and I said, "All right." The judge asked this man, "Are you a citizen?" This man said he could not speak English. Mr. Sypniewski said, "He can not speak English." The judge says, "He knows what I am talking about." Mr. Sypniewski then said, "If you was in France, you would not be able to understand French." He said, "I was in France," and Sypniewski yelled out, "You are a liar; you never were in France." The magistrate says, "You are another liar." I stood between them, and I said to this man Sypniewski, "If you can not act the part of a gentleman here, you are going out, and I would advise you to leave." Then he says, "That means I have got to go out?"

Senator PHIPPS. Who was it called the other a liar first?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Sypniewski.

Senator PHIPPS. There was not any fight?

Mr. WALSH. No; he disputed the magistrate being in France; he disputed him being over there, and the magistrate said he was with the old Eighteenth Regiment, and the magistrate says, "I will give you a smash in the mouth," and I got between them. He went out, and later on he says, "I want some transcripts." I said, "Leave 75 cents for all you want and you can get them. You as an attorney know that you have five days to take an appeal."

Senator McKELLAR. Was 75 cents the only cost for the transcripts?

Mr. WALSH. For each one.

Senator McKELLAR. Was there any reason why any lawyer could not take an appeal upon paying that 75 cents?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he order an abstract before the case was tried?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What about the five-day rule?

Mr. WALSH. Well, there is a five-day rule in which they have five days to take an appeal.

Senator PHIPPS. Are they compelled to give bond after they take an appeal?

Mr. WALSH. Well, they can pay the fine if they wish to, and the fine is paid back to them in case they are successful in the appeal.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you say that the fine is turned back to them?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; and some after fined \$25.

Senator MCKELLAR. There has been a charge made here that there is a custom of arresting those who look like strikers on a charge of suspicious persons, and throwing them into jail and keeping them there. I will explain to you that the testimony is here, that was given here this morning, that a number of men, some 20 or 30 a day, were brought up before this particular magistrate; he asked them whether they were citizens or whether they were foreigners, and whether they were at work. If they say that they were citizens, then whether they were at work. If they said they were at work they were discharged, but if they said they were not at work, well, they were put in jail and fined and put in jail and kept in jail. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. Explain that, please.

Mr. WALSH. Well, they have been arrested at 5 o'clock in the morning or half past 5 or 6 o'clock, four or five men who were standing in alleyways and doorways near the street-car stands, and the men were stopped; they interfered with the men going to work and wherever they may be going. In a great many cases we have found bricks in their pockets. These men were charged with being suspicious persons and were arrested at 5.30 o'clock, and they had a hearing on the charge at 8 o'clock. The judge would ask them if they were at work. He said, "No." Then the judge would say to him—he would ask "What were you doing out on the street at 5 o'clock in the morning with a brick in your pocket?" They would say, "I don't know." Then the judge would say, "Are you on a strike?" They would say, "I don't know." Then the judge would ask, "Are you a citizen?" "No."

He would then get a man to interpret and speak to this man, and the judge would ask the question, "What were you doing on the street or in the alleyway with a brick in your pocket at 5 o'clock in the morning?" and they would not answer the question.

Senator STERLING. The officer had previously testified that that was the condition in which he found the men?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; and he would show the brick to the magistrate. Before the magistrate would question the person he would take the testimony of the officer.

Senator WALSH. Is such a trial what you call a trial de novo—a new trial?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; a new trial—practically a new trial.

Senator WALSH. I understood you to say, Mr. Walsh, that there is a distinction in the matter of bailing a man out, that suspicious persons are treated differently from those that are charged with other misdemeanors?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Are persons who are arrested as suspicious persons prevented from getting bail?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. What is the distinction?

Mr. WALSH. In case a man might be arrested this afternoon or to-night, he would be kept until to-morrow morning until he could get the preliminary hearing.

Senator WALSH. You think that because a man is charged with being a suspicious person that you should hold him without bail for the preliminary hearing?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Don't you appreciate, if that is so, that you ought to be very careful with charging a man about being a suspicious person, because that is taking away his right which he ought to have to be bailed out at once?

Mr. WALSH. Well, we are very careful, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is a complaint that is seldom resorted to—

Mr. WALSH. We are very careful in charging a man—

Senator WALSH. Is that lawyer here?

Mr. RUBIN. No.

Senator McKELLAR. How many cases of this kind, where the parties are charged with being suspicious persons, would you have a day for the last 30 days?

Mr. WALSH. Well, some days we may have six or seven suspicious persons and then other days only three and only one.

Senator McKELLAR. How many did they have at that station this morning?

Mr. WALSH. This morning they had 16.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, take it a year ago, when there was no strike, say a year ago to-day, about how many would there have been at that time? Of course, I do not expect you to be accurate, but about how many suspicious persons would you have, say?

Mr. WALSH. Probably a half dozen.

Senator PHIPPS. There are more now than usual?

Mr. WALSH. There were more this morning than usual.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the greatest number you have had in the last two months? What is the total number, no matter what the charge might be?

Mr. WALSH. I think to-day is the greatest number we have had—34 cases.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you remember a morning when you had something like 50 cases?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Where you had 30, where you heard 10, and held over the remaining 20 until the next day?

Mr. WALSH. That never happened. Day before yesterday we only had three cases.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you examined those complaints, Mr. Brennen?

Mr. BRENNEN. I would not say that I had.

Senator WALSH. I notice that you said something about an officer finding a man with a brick in his pocket. One of the witnesses said something about an officer putting a brick in a man's pocket.

Mr. WALSH. That might be so, but I would like to have some proof of that first.



Senator WALSH. Mr. Brennen, you have not practiced in any of these cases?

Mr. BRENNEN. No; they always have treated me right over here.

Mr. WALSH. I believe that they had a man here this morning—

Senator WALSH. That man omitted any reference to the brick.

Mr. WALSH. I believe that they had a man here this morning that complained; they had an attorney by the name of McNair. This man came here, and he said he came to represent some person, but he did not know who, and three men came out charged with being drunk, and he stepped up to defend those men, and he did not know the men and he didn't know who he was to defend. They were discharged by the magistrate.

Senator WALSH. You will agree, will you not, Mr. Commissioner, that any organization, any charitable society or labor society, or any society, or any friend, has the right even if they do not know the name for whom they are to appear, has the right to appear for those men, and are not the magistrates always willing to have a defendant represented by somebody who can bring out all the evidence before him?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Now, this man, Mr. Sypniewski, when he was there, did you know of his having a stenographer there at the same time?

Mr. WALSH. I did.

Senator STERLING. Do you know whether the stenographer had any facilities for taking the notes?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; we brought him up to the desk right before the magistrate, with a notebook.

Senator STERLING. What about the tone in which the officer and the magistrate confers with each other or in which the testimony would be given?

Mr. WALSH. Well, it would be about the same tone that you are talking now to me.

Senator STERLING. Would there be any difficulty at all in hearing what he said?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, just think that over a minute, Mr. Walsh. We want to be rather careful about this. You stated that the stenographer was permitted to sit up close to the magistrate?

Mr. WALSH. He did not ask for a seat. He just asked if he could come up to the desk. The magistrate was sitting here [indicating] and the clerk taking the notes here [indicating], and the prisoner here [indicating], and the officer here [indicating], and the man taking the notes was standing next to the officer like this [indicating], here between the officer and the magistrate [indicating].

Senator PHIPPS. And he was not so far away as the length of this table?

Mr. WALSH. He was as close as this reporter here is to me.

(Thereupon, at 6.30 o'clock p. m., the hearing was adjourned until 2 o'clock the following day, Oct. 12, 1919.)



## INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Pittsburgh, Pa.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to adjournment, at 2 o'clock p. m. in the Federal Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., Hon. William S. Kenyon presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Sterling, Phipps, McKellar, and Walsh of Massachusetts.

Also present: J. Edward Ashmead, Prudential Building, Newark, N. J., appearing for the United States Steel Corporation; W. B. Rubin, attorney for the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have been anxious to divide this time as equitably as we could, and we will go ahead with your witnessess, Mr. Ashmead, and then we will be ready to hear any witnesses for the other side.

Mr. ASHMEAD. If the committee please, we presented some testimony in Washington with reference to the question of the rates of wages. The men we have here are from the laboring classes drawing the lower rates of pay. We have 8 or 10 of those men, and they have been selected from the different industries, so that the committee might inquire into the conditions at the mills, so far as they represent that class.

The CHAIRMAN. You represent the Steel Corporation?

Mr. ASHMEAD. Yes, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF RICHARD RAYMOND.

(Richard Raymond was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. ASHMEAD. Mr. Raymond, where are you employed?

Mr. RAYMOND. At the Vandergrift sheet and tin mill.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Where were you born?

Mr. RAYMOND. England.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. RAYMOND. Thirty-three years.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Will you tell the committee—what wages do you get?

Mr. RAYMOND. Forty-three cents an hour.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Will you tell the committee the conditions that exist at the plant among the laboring classes employed there?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir; to the best of my ability. The conditions, as far as I am able to judge, are very favorable. I have not heard of any complaints whatever.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Do you want me to go on questioning him, Mr. Chairman, or does the committee desire to question him?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will go on with the questioning. You have worked in this plant how long?

Mr. RAYMOND. Thirty-three years.

The CHAIRMAN. You have worked in the plant 33 years?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these wages you speak of the highest wages you ever received?

Mr. RAYMOND. Well, I received a little higher wages at one time when I worked on a steam hammer.

The CHAIRMAN. Have your wages been raised in the last few years?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What did you make in 1914—how much an hour?

Mr. RAYMOND. At the work I am doing it was 17 cents an hour when I started, and now I get 43.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you belong to the union?

Mr. RAYMOND. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever belonged to the union?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you cease to be a member of the union?

Mr. RAYMOND. After the strike in 1893.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed in the mill where you are working?

Mr. RAYMOND. I think, to the best of my knowledge, somewhere about 3,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many hours a day do you work?

Mr. RAYMOND. I work 12 hours a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any complaint about the conditions in the mills?

Mr. RAYMOND. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are perfectly satisfied?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a family?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many in the family?

Mr. RAYMOND. Nine living and two dead.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, the children?

Mr. RAYMOND. Nine children now.

The CHAIRMAN. And you support them on \$4.52 a day?

Mr. RAYMOND. Well, they support themselves pretty well now, for my youngest is about 22.

The CHAIRMAN. And you raised a family on that?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How far apart are the ages of your oldest and your youngest?

Mr. RAYMOND. Well, now, the nearest I can tell, my oldest—well, my oldest is dead, but my next one—I was married May 6, 1875, and I think my oldest one now must have been born about 1878, while my youngest one is somewhere about, I think, 21, somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you own your own home?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And have you made that by saving out of your wages?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you have raised this large family, too?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How many boys and how many girls are there in the family?

Mr. RAYMOND. I have five boys and four girls.

Senator McKELLAR. You must be an unusually good manager.

Mr. RAYMOND. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they go to school?

Mr. RAYMOND. Sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Do your children go to school?

Mr. RAYMOND. They are all married but one.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but as they grew up, did they go to school?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They went through the common schools, did they?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How much do you receive a day for your 12 hours' work?

Mr. RAYMOND. I receive \$6.02.

Senator PHIPPS. \$6.02. Has there been any reduction in your pay since the war was over?

Mr. RAYMOND. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You are getting the same rate now?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know whether or not there has been any reduction in the price of steel?

Mr. RAYMOND. No; I do not know anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any reduction in the cost of living?

Mr. RAYMOND. No; I guess not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think you could raise that family now on these wages?

Mr. RAYMOND. Well, I do not know; they have never been hungry yet, and I believe we could give it a good rub now without getting hungry.

Senator McKELLAR. You say you own your own home. What kind of a home have you? I do not mean to be impertinent at all, but I want to find out conditions; that—

Mr. RAYMOND. Why, a good workingman's house; a good 5-room house.

Senator McKELLAR. It is a good 5-room house? Five rooms?

Mr. RAYMOND. Six rooms.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe in the 12-hour day?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to work 12 hours a day yourself?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir; I can stand 12 hours a day.

Senator McKELLAR. Why do you want a 12-hour day?

Mr. RAYMOND. I am like the rest; I want to get what money I can.

Senator McKELLAR. You want to make more money?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How old are you, Mr. Raymond?

Mr. RAYMOND. Sixty-seven.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Have you had any trouble getting any complaint that you might want to present past the foreman?

Mr. RAYMOND. No, sir; not one bit.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Have you ever had any reason to complain of your treatment by the steel company?

Mr. RAYMOND. No, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Have the conditions been improving in the steel company's plants among the laboring classes?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir; considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. Improving? What do you mean by improving?

Mr. RAYMOND. It has been improving in regard to money matters, and I am certain of one thing which has been improving, that men certainly do not work nearly so hard as I had to when I first came here.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they work the same hours?

Mr. RAYMOND. They only work 10 hours—the general laborers only work 10 hours, and in my position, there is two of us, and there has to be one there all the time. I attend to the getting out of the tools to the sheet-mill men, and I have to be right in the office to give the tools to them and to get those tools to the blacksmith shop and to get them fixed and back.

Senator McKELLAR. You said that you had five boys. Do they work for the company?

Mr. RAYMOND. I have three of them up here, and I have got one out in Kensington, and I have got one at—that big mill.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they all work in the steel company's mills?

Mr. RAYMOND. No; this one out in Kensington is a pattern maker, working on aluminum.

Senator McKELLAR. And three of the sons work for the mills?

Mr. RAYMOND. I have two of them at work at Vandergraft at the mill, and one of them—I had two of them over in France in the Army, and one of them is not well, and he has done nothing since he came back. He is a telegraph operator, and he has not done nothing since about eight months back.

Senator McKELLAR. What do those two boys make who work in the Vandergraft mill?

Mr. RAYMOND. I do not know. The wages vary. Why, they say, \$10 or \$11 for eight hours.

Senator McKELLAR. They have families of their own, or do they live by themselves, or where?

Mr. RAYMOND. They are all married but one, and that is my youngest son, he is with us; then I have one son with us and three children, but his wife, I am sorry to say, she quit her husband and he is with us, with the children.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you grandchildren?

Mr. RAYMOND. Yes, sir; I have two of the grandchildren and my daughter has one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Witness; I am much obliged to you.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. JAMES LLOYD.

(James Lloyd was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. ASHMEAD. Mr. Lloyd, where are you employed?

Mr. LLOYD. I am employed by the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co., Deweesewood Works, in McKeesport.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What nationality are you?

Mr. LLOYD. Well, I am born in this country, gentlemen—Scotch and Welsh.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How long have you been in the steel business?

Mr. LLOYD. Well, I have been working for the steel corporations for 30 years, 15 with the National Tube Co., from there—about the same with the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What are your wages?

Mr. LLOYD. Forty-two cents an hour at the present time.

Mr. ASHMEAD. On the eight-hour-a-day basis?

Mr. LLOYD. I work 10 hours and all over 8 hours time and a half.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Have you any objections to the 10-hour day?

Mr. LLOYD. I have not. The job I have is not hard, and I have plenty of leisure time.

Senator McKELLAR. How many days in the week do you work?

Mr. LLOYD. Five days and a half, and some times I am off at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. The company allows me to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your work?

Mr. LLOYD. I get out store-mill supplies for the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. You get out supplies?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir; I get out all the different machinery, whatever they get in there.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are working in that plant?

Mr. LLOYD. I could not say just how many, but I suppose in the neighborhood of about 500.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there out on strike?

Mr. LLOYD. I can not answer. I do not know of any Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you do not know of any Americans?

Mr. LLOYD. There are some Hungarians.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they belong to the union?

Mr. LLOYD. I do not know whether they belong to the union or not?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you belong to a union?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever belong to the union?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have no fault to find with conditions there?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have no objection to a 10-hour day?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard any of the men on strike say why they went out?

Mr. LLOYD. Indeed I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a married man?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a family?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir; two living and two dead.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you own your own home?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you rent your place?

Mr. LLOYD. I board my son-in-law, and he lost his wife about a month ago.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you ever asked to join a union?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir; I was not.

Senator PHIPPS. Before this strike was called on the 22d of September, was there any vote taken in the mill as to whether the men would strike or stay on the job?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir; not as I heard of.

Senator PHIPPS. If there had been a vote taken, would you have known of it?

Mr. LLOYD. I suppose I would have known of it, if they were around in the place where I am. The place I am at, all can come in.

Senator PHIPPS. Were they talking about the strike?

Mr. LLOYD. I did not hear them talk strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you see any of the strike ballots?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir; I did not.

Senator PHIPPS. Have your wages been reduced since the war stopped?

Mr. LLOYD. No; I am perfectly satisfied.

Senator PHIPPS. You are working on a 42-cent per hour basis?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. If you wanted to do hard work, could you make more?

Mr. LLOYD. I have made it under other conditions, but I got a spell of sickness once, and I was off for nearly a year. My job was held for me by the company.

Senator PHIPPS. What had you been making before you took sick?

Mr. LLOYD. I do not know how—that is a good long time back, and wages were not very high, but I was getting the standard price for blacksmith helper.

Senator PHIPPS. You were getting the standard price for blacksmith helper?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What do you understand to be the cause of this strike?

Mr. LLOYD. Well, now, I tell you, gentlemen, I am a man that attends to my own business, and tries to do what is right by my employers, and always I do, and I don't never be around where the strike is, because a strike gets you nothing. When a man goes on strike, even to be out a week, or even to be out two weeks, or even to be out one day, he has lost money which is never to be regained, and therefore I do not see why a good sensible man, when he is treated right in the works, where he has an opportunity to work, should do such things. We have got there in our plant as fine a foreman as there is in the United States. There is none better. I know them all. I have had dealings with them all. They treat you right. I have been treated right, although I always done my part and have tried likewise to do the same to them.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. LLOYD. I want to tell you something else before I go, and that is that we have got one of the finest toilet rooms and bathrooms that there is in the United States for the workmen. We have hot and cold water baths and a place for them to change their clothes, and they have had fine lockers put in there for them.



The CHAIRMAN. And do all the men have access to them?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you had those?

Mr. LLOYD. Well, those have been in since last summer, and I think we have one of the finest in the world. There is no better, and they are clean and sanitary all through, and they have closets on the outside, and there is a man to take care of those toilets.

### TESTIMONY OF C. A. LIGHTHILL.

(C. A. Lighthill was thereupon called as a witness, and having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Give us your name and your business.

Mr. LIGHTHILL. C. A. Lighthill, formerly a heater with the McCutcheon Mills, Carnegie steel plant, located on Rectall Street, north side.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you working now?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. With the McCutcheson Mills. Where I am employed there are between 10 and 12 hundred men in normal times.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are out on the strike?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. None.

The CHAIRMAN. None?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. We have no men on the strike; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what work do you do there?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, I am a sort of utility man.

The CHAIRMAN. What wages do you receive?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Forty-two cents an hour for eight hours, and time and a half for all over that.

The CHAIRMAN. About what wages do you get?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. \$4.62.

The CHAIRMAN. That is for the full time of—

Mr. LIGHTHILL. That is for 10 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a married man?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you own your own home?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you renting a home?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any company houses there?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any children?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. I have four.

The CHAIRMAN. About what are their ages?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. The oldest is 30 and the youngest is 8.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Fifty-two.

The CHAIRMAN. Your children have gone to school, have they?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this as high a wage as you have ever received?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been the highest wages you have ever received?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. From \$6 to \$10 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. In this same plant?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours did you work then?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, I worked 10 hours a day, but let me say there are no steel workers that work 12 hours a day that I know of. I mean by that, there are in the mill those hours, but there are times for rest. For instance, if we find a job is too hard for two men—that is, two jobs are too hard for two men—we put another man on, and those three men do the two jobs. Then we have jobs where four men do two jobs, roughing jobs; at three of the mills there are four men, and these men will work 15 minutes and then they will rest 15 minutes. Where we put three men on two jobs, these men work 30 minutes and then they rest 15 minutes. That is, in addition to the rest during the lunch time, and they are in the lunch room 30 minutes, and at 9 o'clock 15 minutes, and at 3 o'clock in the afternoon 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any complaint by the men of the conditions at the mill or the hours of work?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. No; they are perfectly satisfied, as far as I can say.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not ask for an eight-hour day?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. We could not live at the present wage if we only worked eight hours a day, and our men seem to be perfectly satisfied. We have men that are on the work no more than six hours.

The CHAIRMAN. You want to work the longer hours in order that you can get the money?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. In order that we can get the money. Some of them are very thrifty and saving.

The CHAIRMAN. If you could get a living wage and eight hours work, would you be in favor of the eight-hour day under those circumstances?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, I think a man that does not want to work more than 6 or 8 hours is lazy. I have been accustomed to working 10 or 12 hours a day, and the idea of a man only wanting to work 6 hours or 8 hours—

The CHAIRMAN. You are opposed to the eight-hour-day plan, are you?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. At the present time; yes, sir. Eight hours a day would not be good for young men at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be good for them at the present time? What do you mean by that?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. After next January it might be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. After next January? What do you mean by that?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes; when the prohibition law goes into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think the way to do is to keep them working all the time so they can not drink?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, if you give them too much leisure they are inclined to go to places where they should not go. I am raising a family of boys.

The CHAIRMAN. I have not heard that argument advanced before; that long hours were necessary in order to keep men from drinking.

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, they keep young men away from places where they should not go. When they work those long hours they are tired enough to go home and eat supper and then go to bed.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you favor long hours of work beyond eight hours for boys?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. We do not have any boys there, and that is another question. The only boys we have in our plant work in the hoop department, and they are pieceworkers, and the company gives them so much to do for a day's work, and when that is finished they can go home. It is up to the boy when he goes home.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you believe that certain classes of work are hard and arduous and continually at it will tend to break men down?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, when you find a job like that, we put men on to hold—extra help.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have had nothing to do with placing men to work, have you?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. At the present, no, sir. I had previous to this year.

The CHAIRMAN. What position did you have then?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Heater.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you assign men?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a better position than you have now?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. It is a better position than I have now; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How did it happen that you went to the other position?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, two years ago I was afflicted with a leakage of the heart.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, I did not intend to ask you of your affliction, but it was because of physical condition?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Because of physical conditions, which the steel company would not have anything to do with.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you been in the hospital?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. You have been in the hospital?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What was the occasion of your going to the hospital?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. In 1914 I was sent to the hospital with an infected hand. Let me say this, I followed the testimony as it is given in the newspapers, and to a large part of it I take an exception, and especially that statement of Mr. Gompers in regard to placing men in hospitals incommunicado, I think he said. I think that is the term he used. I think that the gentleman has been misinformed. I was in the hospital in the steel department, and there were probably 300 men there at the time I was there from all parts of the Pittsburgh district. There was one man there whom I knew, and I know that I received the best of treatment. We could not have received any better treatment anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that treatment furnished free?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that the treatment was furnished free?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes; the treatment was furnished free, and I was in bed while I was there.

The CHAIRMAN. And while you were there you were at liberty to see everybody that called?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, from 9 a. m. to 9 p. m. our friends and relatives came into the hospital whenever they pleased. In fact, my wife took dinner with me on two occasions.

The CHAIRMAN. Your wife took dinner with you?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How long were you there?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Ten days.

Senator PHIPPS. And were you paid your daily wage?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. Well, all the time I was idle I was not in the hospital, and I received \$5 for the first 10 days and after that I received \$2.50 a day until I was able to get out and get to work.

Senator PHIPPS. Was there any vote taken in the plant where you worked before September 22; that is, a strike vote?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. They never took a vote and there was no attempt to take a vote?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You would have known of it if there had been one taken?

Mr. LIGHTHILL. I would.

#### TESTIMONY OF ANDY BARILLO.

(Andy Barillo was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you work, Mr. Barillo?

Mr. BARILLO. For the National Tube Co.

Senator PHIPPS. At McKeesport?

Mr. BARILLO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What nationality are you?

Mr. BARILLO. Hungarian.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you a naturalized citizen?

Mr. BARILLO. I have got the first papers.

Senator MCKELLAR. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. BARILLO. I came over here the first time in 1901, September 29.

Senator MCKELLAR. Why is that you have not taken out your papers before?

Mr. BARILLO. I took out the first paper in 1905.

Senator MCKELLAR. And you have not followed that up?

Mr. BARILLO. Well, after awhile, my woman was on the other side of the water, and she was sick over there a year and I go back four years, calling me home to my family, I can not take any over here. In 1908 I go back and I take her to the hospital, and I stay over on the other side for 1910, and she was buried.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are working out there where you are working?

Mr. BARILLO. About 5,000. I could not tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are out on the strike?

Mr. BARILLO. I can not tell you. Four mills are running.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there many of your nationality—that is, from your country, Hungarians, on strike?

Mr. BARILLO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Not many?

Mr. BARILLO. Not many.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you talked with some of those who are striking?

Mr. BARILLO. I don't talk nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you belong to the union?

Mr. BARILLO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been asked to join the union?

Mr. BARILLO. No.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Were you asked to join the union?

Mr. BARILLO. Asked me?

Mr. ASHMEAD. Do you want to join the union?

Mr. BARILLO. No.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Why not?

Mr. BARILLO. Well, the conditions are good in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The conditions are good?

Mr. BARILLO. Good.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that conditions are all right, so far as you are concerned?

Mr. BARILLO. I think so now.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not care to have them any better?

Mr. BARILLO. I think not now. I have never—

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours do you work?

Mr. BARILLO. Eight hours; and after that we get time and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. How much do you get a day?

Mr. BARILLO. \$6.62.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Do you think the men of your nationality would want a shorter day with less pay?

Mr. BARILLO. I do not think so.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Why?

Mr. BARILLO. Well, it is not that.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Do you think that the men of your nationality would want less hours per day with less pay?

Mr. BARILLO. With less pay? I can not tell that.

Mr. ASHMEAD. A shorter day with less pay, or do you want the money for the longer day?

Mr. BARILLO. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think—you do not know what the rest of them want? You just know that you are satisfied yourself?

Mr. BARILLO. I can not tell you that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand us very well?

Mr. BARILLO. No; I can not say I do.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Have you had any cause to complain of the working conditions in this plant?

Mr. BARILLO. They are good enough for me.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN BULOCKO.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand any English.

Mr. BULOCKO. I no speak right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what it is to take an oath to tell the truth?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know?

Mr. BULOCKO. No, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. This is one of the men intimidated out at McKeesport, and had some bricks thrown at him. Where do you work?

Mr. BULOCKO. I work for the tube works, McKeesport.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What is your nationality, Austrian-Hungarian?

Mr. BULOCKO. Austrian-Hungarian.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. BULOCKO. Thirteen.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Thirteen years?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How long have you worked in the steel business?

Mr. BULOCKO. Three years.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Where did you work before that?

Mr. BULOCKO. I worked in the coal mine.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Are you a member of the union?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes; I belong to the unions for coal mine.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Are you a member of the union in the steel mill?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did they ask you to belong to the union?

Mr. BULOCKO. Sure.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What did they say to you?

Mr. BULOCKO. They say, "What is the matter, you no like the union?" I says, "I belong to the union before, six years ago." They say, "What is the matter?" I say, "No good. I know what is good for union. I make some money for the union."

Mr. ASHMEAD. You make the same money now as you did in the union?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. And you do not want to belong to the union?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did you go out on the strike when the strike took place, or did you stay at home?

Mr. BULOCKO. Sure I go out.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Why did you stay at home?

Mr. BULOCKO. Because I was scared to go to work.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Why were you scared?

Mr. BULOCKO. Somebody hit me.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, gentlemen, we will have to have order in the room.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did anybody tell you that they would hit you?

Mr. BULOCKO. They told me first time—he says, "What for you going to work?" I say, "That is none of your business."

The CHAIRMAN. Who told you that?

Mr. BULOCKO. That strike man.

The CHAIRMAN. The man who was on the strike?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes, sir; and I says, "What is the matter you no go to work?" He says, "I show you to-morrow morning what for I no go to work." I says, "Go ahead and try."

The next morning I tried to work, two or three fellows stand on the corner and watch me. He took a stone and threw to me and touched my back. I throw away the dinner bucket.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Had you been out before that? Did you stay home when the strike first occurred?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Why did you do that? Did your wife want you to?

Mr. BULOCKO. My frau say, "You stay home, now; maybe somebody kill you."

Mr. ASHMEAD. Is that the reason you stayed home?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes; I stay home five days.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Then you started back to work?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. That is the time they told you they would get you to-morrow morning?

Mr. BULOCKO. They told me, "You try to work now?" I say, "Yes." They say, "You watch yourself." I said, "Go ahead. I die. I don't care. I know what is good for me."

The CHAIRMAN. After this day that you were hit, whatever day it was, did you go to work the next day?

Mr. BULOCKO. No; I go and stay home.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you stay home?

Mr. BULOCKO. Five days.

The CHAIRMAN. You stayed home five days?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then did you go back to work?

Mr. BULOCKO. After five days I go to work.

The CHAIRMAN. Did anybody strike you again?

Mr. BULOCKO. Then they told me. "You work more, now?" I say, "Yes." He says, "You had better stay home." I say, "I no stay home. I have got a family. What for I stay home?"

The CHAIRMAN. Did you go on to work?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They did not stop you?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they ever threaten you any more?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And that was the end of it?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who this man was.

Mr. BULOCKO. It was in the morning—too damn dark, I can not see the face.

The CHAIRMAN. How early in the morning was it?

Mr. BULOCKO. Six o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a citizen of this country?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got out your first papers?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No papers at all?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been married?

Mr. BULOCKO. Nine years.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. BULOCKO. Thirteen.

The CHAIRMAN. And how old are you?

Mr. BULOCKO. Thirty-three.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any relatives living across the water?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you send money to them, or did you before you were married?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you expect to live in this country the rest of your life?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not expect to go back?

Mr. BULOCKO. I no go back home.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't you become an American citizen?

Mr. BULOCKO. I can not read or write.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any chance to learn to read or write?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to learn to read and write?

Mr. BULOCKO. I want to learn to read and write.

The CHAIRMAN. How does this country differ from your country?

Mr. BULOCKO. It is very different.

The CHAIRMAN. Which country do you like best?

Mr. BULOCKO. This country.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. BULOCKO. Why, it is all right for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have better chances in this country; better opportunities?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. You make more money here, do you?

Mr. BULOCKO. I make more money and hard work.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you want to become an American?

Mr. BULOCKO. I don't know——

Senator McKELLAR. Would you like to be an American citizen?

Mr. BULOCKO. Sure; I like to be an American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. How is your country governed, or used to be governed?

Mr. ASHMEAD. How was Austria governed? Do you know what kind of government they have?

Mr. BULOCKO. Franz Joseph.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever go to school?

Mr. BULOCKO. I can not go to school.

The CHAIRMAN. We have got to have order in the room. We are glad to have you people here, but you must maintain order.

Mr. BULOCKO. I can not go to school; my mother and my father died; and I have two little children and work so I can send them to school.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did you buy any Liberty bonds?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How many?

Mr. BULOCKO. \$100.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you been able to lay up any money?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Have you any complaint of the way you have been treated by the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. BULOCKO. No; not yet.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Have you been treated well?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.



Mr. ASHMEAD. Do you like your work?

Mr. BULOCKO. Sure.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Are you satisfied with a 10-hour day?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Would you like to have a shorter day with less pay?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not like that less-pay business, do you?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to have a shorter day?

Mr. BULOCKO. I no like short days; works then as before.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What do you think was the cause of this strike?

Mr. BULOCKO. That strike, no much good.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What is the reason for it; do you know?

Mr. BULOCKO. I know.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the reason for it?

Mr. BULOCKO. Well, this man he wants lots of money.

The CHAIRMAN. Wants lots of money?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes; and want eight hours work.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you talked with the men on strike—some of them?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What did they tell you?

Mr. BULOCKO. I told them I worked for eight hours; worked for eight hours with nothing to do, and start to work and quit on time.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of work do you do?

Mr. BULOCKO. I am shovel up coal.

The CHAIRMAN. You shovel coal?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes; work for a machine.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you work for the 10 hours—all of the 10 hours you are supposed to work?

Mr. BULOCKO. Ten hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you shovel coal all day long?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any rest?

Mr. BULOCKO. Well, I told the boss I must take a spell of rest.

The CHAIRMAN. How long are those spells?

Mr. BULOCKO. About 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. How often do you take a spell of that kind?

Mr. BULOCKO. I take a spell 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Every hour?

Mr. BULOCKO. Every two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Every two hours you rest 25 minutes?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to learn the English language?

Mr. BULOCKO. Sure I would.

The CHAIRMAN. You would?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had a chance—if you did have a chance to go to night schools, would you go to them?

Mr. BULOCKO. I think I am too old for that now.

The CHAIRMAN. You think you are too old?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Does your wife speak the English language?

Mr. BULOCKO. Not right.

The CHAIRMAN. And your children?

Mr. BULOCKO. I have three children.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they speak the English language—your children?

Mr. BULOCKO. All right, now.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they going to school?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not talk English in your home, do you?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You talk your Austrian language?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And do the children talk the Austrian language at home?

Mr. BULOCKO. They talk the Austrian and the English, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of your children boys?

Mr. BULOCKO. Two boys and one girl.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are the boys?

Mr. BULOCKO. Five years and three years, and the girl seven.

The CHAIRMAN. The girl goes to school?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And does she come home and tell you what she learn at school?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you talk about it at home?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does she tell you? Do you know?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes, sir. She is going the first time this year, and she shows me what she does for school.

Senator McKELLAR. Why don't you talk the English language in your family? why don't you learn it? You are here in our country. Why don't you learn our language?

Mr. BULOCKO. Well, you see, I can not read or write. Maybe I go for school somebody laugh at me.

The CHAIRMAN. Somebody will laugh at you?

Mr. BULOCKO. Sure.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, they laugh at everybody occasionally?

Mr. BULOCKO. No.

Senator PHIPPS. But if the class was composed of men like yourself, they would not laugh at you? Do you get the Austrian papers?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You get papers printed in your language?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. And do you read those?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Where are they printed, do you know? Is it a Pittsburgh paper that you read?

Mr. BULOCKO. I read McKeesport.

Senator PHIPPS. The McKeesport paper?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you expect—are you just going to keep on working in the mills as long as you live?

Mr. BULOCKO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you want to do better than that?

Mr. BULOCKO. It is all right for a citizen. It is all right for me, too.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess that is all.

### TESTIMONY OF JOHN DONTRICK.

(John Dontrick was thereupon called as a witness and having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand English?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What descent are you?

Mr. DONTRICK. I am Austrian descent, American born.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How old are you?

Mr. DONTRICK. Twenty-seven.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Where do you work?

Mr. DONTRICK. National Tube Co., McKeesport.

Mr. ASHMEAD. And what wages do you receive?

Mr. DONTRICK. \$7.75.

Mr. ASHMEAD. And how long do you work a day?

Mr. DONTRICK. Ten hours.

Mr. ASHMEAD. And you receive \$7.75?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. For how many hours?

Mr. DONTRICK. Ten hours, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Were you asked to join the union?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What was said to you at the time?

Mr. DONTRICK. Well, they coaxed me and asked me to go into it. I could not very well understand it, and I just got back from the Army and I did not get the details.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you in the Army?

Mr. DONTRICK. Two and a half years.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you go across?

Mr. DONTRICK. They got me into it, and finally they slipped me a card, and I did not know what it was for, or anything else. It was a union card.

The CHAIRMAN. And what did you pay to join?

Mr. DONTRICK. Three dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. And are you a member of the union now?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did you quit work at the time of the strike?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir. I was out of the mill.

Senator McKELLAR. Who did you pay the \$3 to?

Mr. DONTRICK. I got it off a friend of mine. I got the card. I did not know where the card came from.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know whether it goes to the local union or where?

Mr. DONTRICK. I do not know where it goes.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did you say that you quit work when the rest did?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Were you threatened if you did not quit work?

Mr. DONTRICK. I was threatened if I did not quit work that same day.

The CHAIRMAN. Who threatened you?

Mr. DONTRICK. It was a bunch of men over at the meeting, at Otto, in Glassport.

Senator WALSH. What was the threat?

Mr. DONTRICK. Sir?

Senator WALSH. What was the threat?

Mr. DONTRICK. I belonged to the Veterans of the Foreign Wars, and quite a few of the soldiers were called; there was supposed to be a riot. I was sent down to the hall, and I went down there, and of course they deputized me right away and sent me over. When we went over there, for two hours there was no riots or anything, but the people was sent over the bridge. There was no meeting.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Who sent you down to become a deputy?

Mr. DONTRICK. John Walden, secretary of the Veterans of the Foreign Wars.

Mr. ASHMEAD. The secretary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. And where does he work?

Mr. DONTRICK. I don't know where he works, to tell the truth.

Senator WALSH. Where does he live?

Mr. DONTRICK. McKeesport.

Senator WALSH. What does he do in that community?

Mr. DONTRICK. I don't know.

Senator WALSH. What authority did he have to ask you to become a police officer?

Mr. DONTRICK. I don't know.

Senator WALSH. Did you ever know him before?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir; I belong to the veterans.

Senator WALSH. Does he work with you?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Did they send any other men besides you?

Mr. DONTRICK. There was men down there.

Senator WALSH. Did they send any other men besides you?

Mr. DONTRICK. He sent them down to the mayor.

Senator WALSH. So that when you left the union you went and became a deputy?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. When did you leave the union?

Mr. DONTRICK. A couple of days after I got the card.

Senator WALSH. When did you become a deputy?

Mr. DONTRICK. On the 22d; just two hours we were called out.

Senator WALSH. When did you join the union, what day?

Mr. DONTRICK. That was in August, something, I do not just know what day it was.

Senator WALSH. Did you attend any meetings?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir; and therefore I can not see into this union.

Senator WALSH. Are you a special police officer, a deputy?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. When did you stop becoming a special police officer?

Mr. DONTRICK. I did not take it to stay on steady, because I am working in the mill. That was two hours.

Senator WALSH. And you were sworn in to protect the peace and order?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. What instructions were given you?

Mr. DONTRICK. All the instructions I got was to see there was not any trouble.

Seantor WALSH. Were you given a gun?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Did you have one?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Were you given a club?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Who gave you the club?

Mr. DONTRICK. I was given a club at police headquarters.

Senator WALSH. And what were you told about it? What did they say to you as to how to use it?

Mr. DONTRICK. I was told to use it for your own protection?

Senator WALSH. Did you use it?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir; there were no clubs used.

Senator McKELLAR. How many ex-soldiers work in that plant out there that you know of?

Mr. DONTRICK. In the plant where I am working?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DONTRICK. Quite a few. I could not tell you the exact number.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there any soldiers on strike out there?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. The soldiers remained in?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir; so far as I know all of the American people are at work.

Senator McKELLAR. So far as you know, all of the American people are at work?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know any of the foreigners that went out?

Mr. DONTRICK. I know quite a few.

Senator McKELLAR. How many remained out? Are the most of them still out?

Mr. DONTRICK. There are lots of them out; yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you an idea of how many are out?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir; there are plenty coming back every day.

Senator McKELLAR. And practically all of the Americans remained in?

Mr. DONTRICK. There was not a one went out that I know of.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know the reasons or the causes of the strike?

Mr. DONTRICK. I do not know just exactly what it would be. To tell the truth, you can not find out. All you can hear is better working conditions, eight hours, and more pay.

Senator McKELLAR. All you can hear is better working conditions, eight hours and more pay?

Mr. DONTRICK. That is all you can get out of them.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you satisfied with the working conditions out there?

Mr. DONTRICK. I am satisfied with the working conditions.

Senator McKELLAR. How are the working conditions down there?

Mr. DONTRICK. The conditions satisfy me all right. I ain't got any complaint.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, about this threat, will you continue with that?

Mr. DONTRICK. Sir?

Senator McKELLAR. About this threat that was made, will you continue with that?

Mr. DONTRICK. Well, after I was off that week I went to work on Monday morning and worked all that week, and on daylight to last week Monday night, and I was coming in between U and Sheridan Streets—I do not know whether you know where that is or not?

Senator McKELLAR. Is it in McKeesport?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir; and I got halfway between the two streets, and somebody bumped me in the head with a brick. I do not know who it was.

Senator WALSH. Somebody hit you?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. In the head?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Was it thrown?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Was that since the strike began?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes; just last week, Monday evening.

Senator STERLING. What particular work do you do?

Mr. DONTRICK. I am working on a furnace.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been working there?

Mr. DONTRICK. Fifteen years, on and off, less what I lost in the Army.

Senator STERLING. Are you a married man?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been getting \$7.75 per day?

Mr. DONTRICK. Since I came back from the Army. The wages went up while I was away.

Senator STERLING. And what were you getting before you left?

Mr. DONTRICK. \$4.65 a day I was getting before I left.

Senator STERLING. And you have been raised nearly 50 per cent—more than that?

Mr. DONTRICK. Almost double.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find the cost of living any higher than before you went into the Army?

Mr. DONTRICK. Why, yes; I found that out when I started to get my clothes.

Senator PHIPPS. Was there any strike vote taken in the mill?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir; unless they had it before I came back from the Army.

Senator PHIPPS. When did you come back?

Mr. DONTRICK. It is three months now.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you back as early as the 20th of July?

Mr. DONTRICK. I was here in July.

Senator PHIPPS. The strike vote was supposed to be taken between July 20 and August 20.

Mr. DONTRICK. It was not taken in those mills that I know of.

Mr. ASHMEAD. You had a union card?

Mr. DONTRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did you get a ballot?

Mr. DONTRICK. No, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. You were not a union man in July or August?

Mr. DONTRICK. In August I was a union man.

Senator MCKELLAR. Late in August you became a union man?

Mr. DONTRICK. Late in August I became a union man.

Mr. ASHMEAD. We have some more witnesses along the same line, but I do not care to take up any more time unless you should want to hear them. We have here the foreman and superintendent of the mill that Mr. O'Reilly testified about yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us take one of them.

### TESTIMONY OF AUGUST MANN.

(August Mann was thereupon called as a witness and, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. MANN. Superintendent of the American Steel & Wire Works at Denora.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you held that position?

Mr. MANN. Since September three years ago—at Denora.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed out there?

Mr. MANN. At the wire mill 2,000, and 4,300 at the entire plant.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are out on strike?

Mr. MANN. About 3,200, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many of those are what are termed "foreigners"?

Mr. MANN. There are about 66 per cent foreigners in the entire plant.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you say foreigners what do you mean by that? Do you say that 65 per cent of the workers are foreigners?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what do you mean by foreigners?

Mr. MANN. I say Hungarians.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that they are not naturalized men or those who do not speak the English language?

Mr. MANN. Those who do not speak the English language properly; yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Are there a number of foreign birth and descent who may not have been naturalized even but who do speak the English language?

Mr. MANN. Why. I consider the foreign descendant people as American.

Senator WALSH. Such as the last witness?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Of the men now out on strike, what percentage of them are foreigners under your definition?

Mr. MANN. Well, I guess about 90 per cent at the present time, because we have mostly the American boys in the mills to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there as many out on strike now as there has been at any time?

Mr. MANN. No; the number out on strike is growing less every day.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the peak of the number who went out on strike?

Mr. MANN. Well, I guess there were about 4,100 out.

The CHAIRMAN. And that left about 200 in the mill?

Mr. MANN. That left about 200 in the mill; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many of those belonged to the union?

Mr. MANN. It is hard to tell. We don't know. We do know that the majority portion of these men wanted to work, but were frightened.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that?

Mr. MANN. Because we have instances where they were pulled back; where they were pulled off; pulled off the steps leading across the railroad at our own plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you prohibit meetings out there?

Mr. MANN. We have had meetings right along until, I believe, this last week; that is, open meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. The meetings are now prohibited, are they?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And how is that done?

Mr. MANN. They can have their own meeting, but not a public meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. How is that done? How do they hold their meetings, in their own hall?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But they can not have a public meeting?

Mr. MANN. They can not have a public meeting. They have had public meetings outside of the town.

The CHAIRMAN. Can other associations out there have public meetings?

Mr. MANN. That is more than I know, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have there been any public meetings, any political meetings up there?

Mr. MANN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not permit those?

Mr. MANN. I have not seen any, at any rate, during the election.

Senator PHIPPS. Were there any disturbances at any of their public meetings?

Mr. MANN. No, sir; I do not think there were.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any disturbances growing out of the strike?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir. They formed a parade and they started over toward Monessen, about 2,000 or 2,500 strong. At the time they were on the opposite side of the river, in the other county, crossing the bridge, and a man told me that there were between 200 and 600 shots. I heard the shots, but I could not estimate them. I know that there were quite a number of shots fired.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anybody hit?

Mr. MANN. No; on the other side of the river.

Senator McKELLAR. What were the shots for?

Mr. MANN. Well, I think it was for more. When a crowd gets together, you know, somebody wants to pull a gun and shoot, and



everyone had a gun in their pocket, and they felt that they had to shoot.

Senator WALSH. It was just a demonstration?

Mr. MANN. Just a demonstration; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We had a gentleman here last night from there—Mr. O'Reilly.

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You know him, do you?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And he complained there was no way of getting complaints to the bosses, and spoke of some trouble he had with the foreman. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. MANN. I know the entire thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us about it.

Mr. MANN. I think Mr. O'Reilly did not have any complaint in the first place. He went to the roller, as he said, and complained about being abused, and came and seen me, as well, and I told him at the time that I would talk to the roller, but in place of talking to the roller I watched them personally in the mill, as much as I could, as much as my time would allow me, and I saw no instance where Mr. O'Donnell abused him.

Senator STERLING. Mr. O'Reilly used the word "foreman."

Mr. MANN. The head roller is what we term it in our mill.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How long had Mr. O'Donnell been in the employ of the company?

Mr. MANN. Forty some years. It was ahead of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. If a man had a complaint in regard to the foreman, would he come to you?

Mr. MANN. Positively. My office is always open.

Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. O'Reilly said that when he went over the head of his foreman, that the next day the superintendent told him, as I recall, told him to go back, and that when he went back the next day the foreman told him that he did not like it, and if he did not like it he could get out, and he got out. Now, it seems to me, the impression I had, that that is not fair treatment. If he had a complaint, it ought to be passed upon by somebody, and it should be done in a fair and courteous way.

Senator PHIPPS. My recollection is that after the first occurrence, that he complained to the superintendent, and after he went back to straighten it out with the foreman, that the foreman told him that if he did not like it he could quit, and that he did quit, and he went out and searched for work elsewhere for some three months, and later he returned to the plant, and he saw the superintendent, who told him that he could fix it up with the foreman; if he could fix it up with the foreman it was all right with him.

Senator MCKELLAR. I do not think it is exactly fair treatment. If he had an honest complaint, why should not the superintendent having charge of the work arrange that complaint, or arrange to hear that complaint, and not send him back to the foreman with whom he had trouble?

Mr. MANN. May I explain?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. O'Reilly came and made the complaint.

Senator McKELLAR. Did he come to you?

Mr. MANN. I think it was general—he came to me after he had spoken to the roller. I do not know that he had spoken to him, but I do know that he came to see me. In my estimation it was an imaginary complaint. There was nothing in the complaint.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What was the complaint?

Mr. MANN. That he was not being properly treated by the roller, and I told him to go back, and I would have a talk with the roller, and I personally watched in order to see whether the roller did abuse him in any way, to see if he abused him in any way or manner, and the thing went on, and for weeks he had been to me three or four times, and still I was watching, and I knew the roller too well. I said to Mr. O'Reilly "You have got the dad of the rollers."

Mr. ASHMEAD. What do you mean by that?

Mr. MANN. He is the oldest man, and one of the fairest boys we have in the mill.

Mr. ASHMEAD. What had Mr. O'Reilly done?

Mr. MANN. I do not know. At the time Mr. O'Reilly quit us there was some work, the car cut out of the eighth pass in the mill, it goes into a trough, as we call it, the radiators—that is, it is a continuous mill—and it goes to the other rolls, where they are passed, where it is caught on the oval side by a catcher or roll hand. These eight passes fit two mills, one on the right and one on the left, one turning to the right is a very long trough, in fact it runs along the entire building, and there is a bar cut out there, and sticks in the guide in the other mill, it goes itself into a loop, and if it is not taken and properly straightened out, you will cause a great deal of trouble in that mill, and also it will snarl this bar, the snarl will run against the rolls, and they are either partially stuck in the rolls or break off, or break off on the outside, particularly if the second bar comes in the other trough, which means not only a great amount of work for the men in the mill, but as well as the loss of time and the scrap that is being produced through this bar-breaking and sticking.

Senator McKELLAR. Is it against the rules of the company for an employee to appeal for redress to the superintendent, without first going to his boss, his immediate superior?

Mr. MANN. No.

Senator McKELLAR. Evidently Mr. O'Reilly felt that, and evidently he acted upon that, and evidently no man would give up a \$16 a day position, no sensible man, and he appears to be quite a sensible man, would give up a \$16 a day place on an imaginary grievance, and it is perfectly evident, or it seems to me, from what you say about it, that you did not give him very much satisfaction.

Mr. MANN. I did, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. I would not have considered it, from your own statement; I would not have considered it——

Mr. MANN. Particularly where I had personally a great interest in Mr. O'Reilly.

Senator McKELLAR. You say that you had personally a great interest in Mr. O'Reilly?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; he seems to be a very engaging man.

Mr. MANN. He is a very nice man, a gentleman at all times, and I certainly thought as much of Mr. O'Reilly as even the roller, and I went in so as to find out in my own way where the trouble was, to make my own investigation, and I did not find in that investigation that he was being abused.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you explain that to him before he resigned?

Mr. MANN. Most undoubtedly, sir. I talked to Mr. O'Reilly time and again on it, and after he came back, Mr. O'Donnell and I had spoken together, and I persuaded Mr. O'Reilly to see Mr. O'Donnell, because I did not think it proper to place a man in a department over the boss's head, and so I asked him to see Mr. O'Donnell, and I spoke to Mr. O'Donnell, and Mr. O'Donnell had, in addition to that, had held the job open for him all this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know that there were as many men belonging to the union before the time of the strike?

Mr. MANN. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you report to your superior officer as to the number of men belonging to the union in the mill?

Mr. MANN. No; the fact of the matter is, that we do not pay any attention to that.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you discharge the men for having joined the union? How many have you discharged?

Mr. MANN. I do not know as we discharged any, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know whether any were discharged?

Mr. MANN. I say we did not.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that you were surprised that so many men went out?

Mr. MANN. They did not go out at that time. They were locked out.

Senator PHIPPS. Who locked them out?

Mr. MANN. Those that belonged to the union and went out.

Senator STERLING. Was it within their power to lock them out?

Mr. MANN. No; to stop then, not to let them go in.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you call a lockout?

Mr. MANN. I do not know. It is an expression of mine. Probably that is not the right term. Probably I did not use the right term. They were not permitted to go into the mill, we will put it that way.

Senator STERLING. Do you know that as a fact, that they were not permitted to go into the mill, from your observation?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever see them when they did not permit them to go in?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir. They were even prohibited from taking material into the mill. I was personally there.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did you ever talk to these men about a 10-hour day?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I have spoken to quite a few of the boys, particularly to the foreign boys, and it is a matter of money to them, not of time. In fact, they would resent eight hours to a large extent, because it would reduce their wages. The more money they make the better they are satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have to work them the 12 hours?

Mr. MANN. Yes; in some places, we can not get around the 12 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Could not you put on three 8-hour shifts, instead of two 12-hour shifts?

Mr. MANN. Well, if you went to start that, the majority portion of the men—we would not have the houses to take care of them.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the houses——

Mr. MANN. You have not the additional houses in this vicinity.

The CHAIRMAN. And additional men would need additional houses?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you house all the men in the plant?

Mr. MANN. No; and we have not got a house, and a great many of the men now do not live in Donora.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of other great industries in the country which have the 12-hour day? Don't most of the industries in the country have an 8-hour day?

Mr. MANN. No; I have not made any specific inquiry of that, but I do know that in many of the mills they do work 12 hours.

Mr. ASHMEAD. They do work 12 hours? Do they work 12 hours?

Mr. MANN. The entire mill does not work the 12 hours, as I said, but in this particular department where Mr. O'Reilly works, the department itself works 12 hours, and they spell every half hour. Now, in Mr. O'Reilly's department, Mr. O'Reilly has a position that takes off of the 12 hours, he is practically in there these 12 hours, but of these hours he has a bench, and it is near his work where he can sit down and watch the operation of the mill.

Mr. ASHMEAD. He is not working the whole 12 hours, you mean?

Mr. MANN. He is not working the whole 12 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any responsibilities on him while he is sitting down?

Mr. MANN. Well, he has to watch to see that the bar is the proper size.

The CHAIRMAN. And he has to be there at that time?

Mr. MANN. He has to be there at that time; yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Is that same thing true with other workmen who work the 12 hours?

Mr. MANN. Well, they work one-half hour and they rest one-half hour, the roll hands.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they have anything to do during that half hour?

Mr. MANN. They work a half-hour and another man takes their position the other half-hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Can they go outdoors for a half-hour if they wish?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; the roll hands, the sticker in.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of the men are the stickers in?

Mr. MANN. In that mill—let us see, there are probably somewhere about 100.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred altogether?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, the rest of the men who work the 12 hours, do they have rest in that 12 hours?

Mr. MANN. The work is not constant for the other workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now, a man starts in working at 6 o'clock in the morning, and he works until 6 o'clock at night. Is he doing work all of that time, whether it be——?

Mr. MANN. No; the machinery at a certain hour in the morning, usually 8 to 9, the machinery goes down where the roll men will change the rolls. That gives the other men an opportunity to rest.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they have any responsibility during that time?

Mr. MANN. Well, no, I do not think they have.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they have to be there?

Mr. MANN. Yes; we will keep them in the mill, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Ready to be called?

Mr. MANN. We keep them in the mill ready when the whistle blows to start, and when the changes are made.

Senator STERLING. What intervals of rest do the men have from physical labor in that 12-hour day?

Mr. MANN. These men that work the straight 12 hours have a half hour out of every hour.

Senator PHIPPS. Take the other men that work the 12 hours a day, other than the rollers, they have one-half hour rest and a half hour of work?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir. Now, the other men, they take their spells out at any given time. A great many of them will sit down at 9 o'clock and take lunch. A great many of them will go out to the drinking fountain and sit down there. There is no time given for that, but they will take their rest.

The CHAIRMAN. But they are on duty all of this time, are they not?

Mr. MANN. They are on duty all of this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Subject to call?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess we have got that cleared up.

Senator WALSH. Have any efforts been made to employ men to take the places of the strikers and to keep the plant going?

Mr. MANN. We have not tried to bring in outside men.

Senator WALSH. And the only men who are working now are the former employees?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Men who have been in your employ all the time?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you say that a thousand have come back?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; 1,084 yesterday.

Senator WALSH. Now, I would like to ask about the system of promotion? I suppose you have many departments in your plant?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; we have, sir.

Senator WALSH. What plan have you ever followed that you will give to the new employee that goes in, in the lowest position in your mill, what chance is there for him to get up to the highest position?

Mr. MANN. That is according to his ability and his work, sir.

Senator WALSH. Is there a responsibility upon the foreman of each department to produce a certain amount of work?

Mr. MANN. Well, we always expect the maximum. We expect that, but we do not get it.

Senator WALSH. What I have in mind is a system that I have seen, not in the steel industry, but in the textile industry, and where I have

known young men leaving school to start in at a certain wage in a certain branch of the industry to make it their profession, and to reach the highest place in that particular department—

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And the rivalry between the foremen, because of their desire to produce as much as possible, resulted in preventing that man from going from one grade to another because he was so valuable to his foreman. Do you follow me?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And I have found that a great many American boys have gone out of the factories or the mills or the factories or the industries because there was not a recognition among the foremen of their laudable desire to go up and to advance.

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And that between the foremen there was so much rivalry that once a boy got out of one department he would have to get out of that industry. Have you heard of that?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Particularly where there was a very exacting demand upon the foremen to produce so much, that is, a certain amount of work, and, of course, he holds on to the best man?

Senator PHIPPS. I suggest that the witness give his own personal experience.

Mr. MANN. Well, I started to work in 1884. I started to work in 1884 in St. Louis, Mo. I started making barbed wire, where the man set in the wire by hand rather than by machinery. I worked in that department for several years. From there I went to the nail—to the wire-nail mill—and from that branch of the barbed wire, then to the drawing department—that is, wire-drawing department—and from the wire-drawing department I went into the galvanizing, the galvanizing of galvanized wire, where I became foreman. I worked there for about six years. I left that position and took a job on the rolls, the same as Mr. O'Reilly—not the same job, but in a department just like it—and I worked there for about a year, then was appointed as assistant superintendent of the Braddock Mills at Braddock, Pa. From there I was placed as superintendent at the Rankin Works, which was in 1902. In 1906 I was appointed superintendent at Denora, and then I left the company and came back two years after as superintendent of one of the smallest mills we had at Salem, Ohio. I was again advanced to Anderson, Ind., superintendent. Another advancement came to Sharon, Pa., and from there back to Denora.

Senator PHIPPS. These are all plants of the American Steel & Wire Co.?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; and I worked in those departments that I mentioned. I worked as laborer quite awhile in Denora.

Senator WALSH. Now, tell us what you plan to do in your factory, in your establishment. What is the system in vogue for promotion?

Mr. MANN. We daily confer—the superintendent has his conference with his foreman daily, and makes inquiries as to the most likeable boy in the department—that is, in his work. We then follow that boy up and watch him, to see whether he has the particular qualifications to become a foreman; and if he has he becomes eventually an assistant foreman and from that to a foreman. The appointment of

an assistant foreman is not made by the foreman himself. He is recommended at times to the superintendent.

Senator WALSH. I am very glad to hear that, because the constant complaint I hear, not relating to your history, is that these plants have grown so big that there is no chance for the individual, as there was 25 or 30 or 40 years ago; and only by some cooperative plan such as you suggest can the ability of an individual be recognized.

Mr. MANN. May I answer you, that we would not be permitted to work any differently by our company. It would mean the dismissal of the superintendent if he did not work that way. Our company insists that we give those that have the proper qualifications a chance for those positions, and it is also as much as the superintendent's position is worth to permit any of the foremen to ill treat any of their employees.

Senator PHIPPS. We understand that this is a nonunion plant. Suppose that you are operating a union plant, and where there is a union plant would there be any difficulty in carrying on this policy that you have in force now for promotion?

Mr. MANN. That may be. I have never had charge of any such plant—

Senator PHIPPS. And you do not know?

Mr. MANN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. I am interested in the housing conditions at Denora. What have you to say about that?

Mr. MANN. The company has put up 100 houses, 60 single and 20 double concrete houses.

Senator McKELLAR. Of how many rooms each?

Mr. MANN. A few with four rooms, and they run up to six rooms.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they have baths?

Mr. MANN. They have baths and heat and hot water.

Senator STERLING. Do the four-room houses have baths?

Mr. MANN. Every house has a bath.

Senator STERLING. And do you rent those houses out?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What do you rent them for?

Mr. MANN. From \$16 to \$30 a month.

Senator McKELLAR. A six-room house is \$30 a month?

Mr. MANN. No; not always; the six-room house or a double house is not the same as a single house.

Senator STERLING. Is there any subletting on the part of the tenants of parts of the houses to other workmen?

Mr. MANN. We do not permit that.

Senator STERLING. You do not permit that?

Mr. MANN. No; we do not try to. We figure we have a very nice lot of houses. We have put in concrete streets, pavements, steps, and walks around the houses. We have been helping for some time to see if we could get nice green grass around them. We have plenty of trees—with plenty of trees—

Senator PHIPPS. Do many of your workmen live in Charleroi?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; and in Monongahela and Monessen and Webster.

Senator McKELLAR. You spoke of the rest that the rollers get. How much rest do they get?

Mr. MANN. The roll hands?

Senator McKELLAR. The roll hands.

Mr. MANN. They work half an hour and they rest half an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. At what temperature do they work in? It is quite hot?

Mr. MANN. It is quite hot; yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And a man could not well, any human being could not stand it to work there for any long time?

Mr. MANN. No.

Senator McKELLAR. It looked to me as if it would be hard to do.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not think a man could stand it.

Senator McKELLAR. And working half an hour and resting half an hour, that is not too strenuous, in your judgment? It is not too generous, is it?

Mr. MANN. Well, it is generous enough, I think.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that the rule?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. In all plants?

Mr. MANN. In all of our rod mills; yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And it is quite dangerous, too, is it not?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you ever had any accident where the hot rods have injured or killed there—

Mr. MANN (interrupting). Well, I never had a man killed in the rod plant. I have been working around rod mills since 1888, and I have had charge of rod mills since 1900 or 1901, I am not positive.

Senator McKELLAR. And no man killed?

Mr. MANN. No man killed.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there many burned or badly burned?

Mr. MANN. No; not so many; not above the average.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you been able to reduce the number of accidents?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I have been able to reduce the number of accidents. They are away under what they were, I guess, over 50 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. Take these men you just spoke of who handle the hot rods. To what extent have you reduced the accidents in that?

Mr. MANN. I could not give you the percentage possibly, but I know we are not injuring half as many men as we used to, because we have taken better care of the floor on which they work, and so on.

Senator McKELLAR. Could your machinery be so adjusted, the machinery in the mills, so as to still further reduce the number of accidents?

Mr. MANN. I doubt that very much.

Senator McKELLAR. And you think that you are taking—

Mr. MANN (interrupting). Every precaution.

Senator McKELLAR. And you are using up-to-date methods for securing the safety and security of your employees?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; recently a man had a hot rod run through the bottom of his shoe. It was his own fault. We had told him about it, and we had watchmen there for awhile in order to break up the men passing through at this place, but they wouldn't do it. A great many of our accidents are absolutely due to carelessness.



Senator McKELLAR. And in a dangerous place like that they become accustomed to it—it is necessary though to use every precaution.

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. To guard against a man's carelessness as well as against the company's carelessness?

Mr. MANN. That is what the company is trying to do.

Senator McKELLAR. In work of that kind naturally it brings about a greater amount of carelessness on the part of the employee. It is much, for instance, as though you were running a machine; you get running an automobile, and it is not long before you want to run it faster?

Mr. MANN. That is right.

Senator McKELLAR. And so with the handling of these hot rods, you get careless about it in the very nature of things, and you think you have all up-to-date methods for the prevention of accidents?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; we have a safety inspector that goes from department to department and makes notes of where there might be danger of some one being injured, and we act on that.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you got any system of compensation of employees that are injured in this way?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Would you mind stating what that is?

Mr. MANN. The man is taken care of, first of all, by the company, by the physician, and he is allowed—you have that in your own laws; in the laws of Pennsylvania.

Senator McKELLAR. And that is followed out?

Mr. MANN. That is followed out.

Senator STERLING. What has your company done, Mr. Mann, toward furnishing facilities for the education of the foreign employees in your mills?

Mr. MANN. Last winter or fall we started and made an absolute canvass in every department of the mill, in all of our plants, and I insisted that the foremen should go amongst his foreigners and ask them—and then I got this same safety inspector to make a canvass, and toward the last we got 18 boys that were willing to study. We had more, but 18 stuck, and I had arranged, by the request of our company, with several teachers from our schools—that is, from the public schools—and had arranged with the school board to permit us to have rooms, and also the janitor to clean the rooms so these boys may go there and study. We figure that as soon as the mill resumes fully no doubt our company will ask us to do the same thing.

Senator STERLING. Eighteen; is that all?

Mr. MANN. That is all we could get, sir.

Senator STERLING. Why was it that you were not able to get more than 18?

Mr. MANN. We do not know. We asked them.

Senator STERLING. Is it the desire on the part of the young fellows to stay at work in order to earn money?

Mr. MANN. This was after hours.

Senator STERLING. This was after hours?

Mr. MANN. In the evening; and we so arranged it that we had two clerks, where they were working week about, so that one of the clerks would come to school on this week and the other next week, and the others would go on constantly every week.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that it would add efficiency to the plant to offer such inducements to these men who can not speak or write English, to offer such inducements as would enable them to learn the English language and what it is to be an American?

Mr. MANN. Well, I called the boys together one Sunday afternoon; I asked them whether they would not come down from the mill that day, and we had probably 60 that came to see us, and we talked to them in the club room at the mill, and we spoke to them for over an hour and pleaded with them and asked them to come to school, and these men that did come to the school were very much pleased, and they have asked us whether we would start the schools this coming winter.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you going to do so?

Mr. MANN. I have not the slightest doubt but we will.

Senator STERLING. You know that it is desirable—the Americanization of these men so far as it is possible to Americanize them?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir; and so does our company.

The CHAIRMAN. And would not that be a good economic proposition?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that in the reports of the Bureau of Mines it shows that there are a great many more accidents among the men who can not speak English than among those who can speak English?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And will you subscribe to that in your mill?

Mr. MANN. No; because we are watching out for them; every foreman is watching out for them.

The CHAIRMAN. How many languages do you print safety notices in?

Mr. MANN. We get them sent to us, but I could not tell how many. Probably five or six.

The CHAIRMAN. Five or six languages?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What nationality predominates in those mills?

Mr. MANN. Mostly Austro-Hungarians and some Greeks and Russians.

Senator STERLING. And among which nationality is there the less of naturalization?

Mr. MANN. I should think the Russians. The Poles are the easiest; will go the quickest for their citizenship papers.

Senator WALSH. Is it not your opinion that the only way we can get foreigners in large numbers to learn the English language is by compulsory laws?

Mr. MANN. I think it might be a good thing.

Senator WALSH. What would you say of a law which would compel an immigrant to learn the English language, so as to read it and speak it, within five years or be deported?

Mr. MANN. It might be a good law.

Senator WALSH. They can not get them to go to school to learn English without compulsion?

Mr. MANN. I guess that you are right.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you get that work done without the foreign labor?

Mr. MANN. You could not.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not get it done?

Mr. MANN. No. If you dispense with all of the foreign labor, you cut your plants down 50 per cent or more.

Senator McKellar. Could any plan be worked out by which they could be given a limited length of time—so many hours a day—

Mr. MANN (interrupting). That proposition I could not say. I would not like to answer that because I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any rivalry in the different mills, the subsidiary mills of the United States Steel Corporation, as to the amount of production?

Mr. MANN. No, sir.

Mr. ASHMEAD. I would like to ask one question. Mr. O'Reilly said yesterday that he was prevented getting work because of this difficulty with the foreman, getting work in other mills; is that so? Have you any system like that?

Mr. MANN. If there is, I do not know anything about it. Positively not.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Did you report that incident to anybody?

Mr. MANN. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Do you keep a black list?

Mr. MANN. Positively not.

Senator WALSH. And you have no men—

Mr. MANN (interrupting). This is the way we are. If we did that I would have to notify our manager, and our manager never knew that he was out of the works.

Senator WALSH. I speak generally. Do you send a black list to any other employer?

Mr. MANN. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. And if a man tells you that another man is undesirable, is a union man and an agitator—

Mr. MANN. We pay no attention to union men or agitators.

Senator WALSH. Who would have the power to make a black list?

Mr. MANN. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever discharge any man for denouncing the Government or institutions of this country?

Mr. MANN. Well, I probably did discharge a few for not taking Liberty bonds the first year.

The CHAIRMAN. And they simply did not buy Liberty bonds, but were talking against the Government—

Mr. MANN. Well, if they did not buy any we felt that they were not in favor of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you discharged men for being against the Government did you notify anybody?

Mr. MANN. I could not say they were against the Government, but I figured that the men who did not buy bonds were against the Government. We had to do that because we could not sell any bonds originally because they were not taking them, and it was the foreigner that did not—he was no citizen of our country. The citizens of our country were glad to get the Liberty bonds. The very man that we were talking about, R. O'Reilly, he was a heavy buyer of Liberty bonds, and all of the boys who spoke the American language—that is, the American citizens. In his department we sold

in our plant alone, we negotiated for \$470,000, I think, of the Victory loan, \$470,000 worth of bonds.

Senator WALSH. Of course, a good many of the foreigners bought bonds?

Mr. MANN. They all did toward the last.

Senator WALSH. Would you say that a good percentage of them did?

Mr. MANN. We had 100 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men went out of your mill into the war?

Mr. MANN. Well, there were 180 or 190.

The CHAIRMAN. Were any of them foreign born?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they keep up their percentage and in comparison with the Americans?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Did these foreign-born men volunteer as well as the Americans, or were they called by the draft?

Mr. MANN. They were called by the draft.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the Americans, did they volunteer?

Mr. MANN. A great many of our boys volunteered in the beginning.

Senator PHIPPS. When you met these few employees or men, and when they would not buy Liberty bonds, did you report their names as men discharged for that reason?

Mr. MANN. No; we watched them around there for a while, and when we seen them come back, they all come back and bought bonds a few days afterwards.

Senator STERLING. What is the age at which you employ boys?

Mr. MANN. In the mill?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Eighteen.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of the vocational educational system of the State of Pennsylvania, continuation educating system?

Mr. MANN. I did not catch that.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of the continuation education system, 16 years of age, under the laws of Pennsylvania?

Mr. MANN. I do not know.

Senator STERLING. There are laws whereby, after 16 years of age, a boy, until he is a certain age, he is required to attend school four months of the year.

Mr. MANN. Well, if we would take any of them, they would have them—unless they have a certificate from the school, that they have passed such and such a grade—

Senator STERLING (interrupting). Yes.

Mr. MANN. We do not take any until he has reached the age of 18 years.

#### TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL J. O'DONNELL.

(Michael J. O'Donnell was thereupon called as a witness, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. O'Donnell, you are the foreman referred to?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I am the head roller.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a foreman; do they call you a foreman?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes; I am called a foreman sometimes.

The CHAIRMAN. And are you the gentleman of whom Mr. O'Reilly made complaint?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And now you gentlemen may go on and ask him whatever you desire.

Senator McKELLAR. What was that complaint about?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I do not know what he told Mr. Mann, but I know what I told him. I told him to pull out a tooth, to pull it out, and I said that he didn't do it right. He said, "I did do it right." I said "You did not do it right," and he walked on out. I did not have anything more to do about it.

Senator McKELLAR. Did he complain to the superintendent?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Not during that time, that I know of.

Senator McKELLAR. You did not get angry with him?

Mr. O'DONNELL. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. When was this?

Mr. O'DONNELL. It was during the war. He really wanted to go to the Army, I believe, and anything at all would upset him.

Senator STERLING. Is he a good workman?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Oh, he is a fair workman.

Senator STERLING. A man who gets \$16 a day ought to be a pretty good workman?

Mr. O'DONNELL. That is about a year—he has gotten about \$16.50 a day.

Senator STERLING. It takes a fairly good man to get that, does it not?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Well, we shove a man up, you know.

Senator STERLING. And he finally left, did he not?

Mr. O'DONNELL. He left that night. I could not tell you the day it was.

Senator STERLING. He did not complain of you to the superintendent?

Mr. O'DONNELL. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. He just quit?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And then when he came back—why did the superintendent have to take up his case with you. You heard the superintendent's testimony?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I told the superintendent that he could come back before he spoke to me.

Senator STERLING. You get along very nicely now?

Mr. O'DONNELL. No.

Senator McKELLAR. You would not feel hurt because of his going over your head to the superintendent?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I do not know about that. We do not have that all the time, you know, in the mill.

Senator McKELLAR. And you do not permit a man to go over the head of a foreman—

Mr. O'DONNELL. If the man has got any trouble he tells me. I go to the superintendent.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there anything wrong about his appealing to the superintendent?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Oh, no; but I do not care what they say.

Senator McKELLAR. Is it against your rules?

Mr. O'DONNELL. No, sir; it is not against our rules.

Senator McKELLAR. But you do not like it?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Well, just man to man, you know—

Senator STERLING. That was a complaint against you, and naturally would you not expect him to go to the superintendent with that complaint?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Unless you rectified the matter and changed it, he would go to the superintendent?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Were there frequent controversies between you and Mr. O'Reilly?

Mr. O'DONNELL. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Was that all that occurred?

Mr. O'DONNELL. That was all that occurred.

Senator McKELLAR. How long has he worked under you this time?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Well, he was only away about four, or five, or six weeks.

Senator McKELLAR. And did you hold open the job for him?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir; during those six weeks.

Senator McKELLAR. During those six weeks did you go to see him?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I went to see him once, and I told him to come back and work, but he did not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. You are of Irish nationality, are you not?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He is too?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not a very serious matter—

Mr. O'DONNELL. No; it was not a very serious matter.

Senator WALSH. A little difference of opinion; is that it?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. An Irishman loves a scrap, does he not?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I suppose.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How long have you been a roller?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Since 1882.

Mr. ASHMEAD. Are you one of the oldest remaining in the mill?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I am the oldest roller holding a job.

Mr. ASHMEAD. And you have been working since 1882?

Mr. O'DONNELL. No; I have been working since 1875.

Mr. ASHMEAD. And you have been foreman since 1882?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What is your pay?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I get \$550 a month.

Senator McKELLAR. \$6,600 a year.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Before I offer my regular list of witnesses, Mr. Chairman, there are two men who want to tell their stories, which are both interesting and important.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are these men? Do you present these men as witnesses?

Mr. RUBIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to say there was a gentleman here yesterday from McKeesport, a member of the chamber of commerce. Is he here now? If he is here, we will hear him this afternoon.  
(No response.)

### TESTIMONY OF JOE KERSPINACH.

(Joe Kerspinach was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a naturalized American, Mr. Kerspinach?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What nationality are you?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Austrian.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you get your last papers?

Mr. KERSPINACH. 1911.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead with your story.

Mr. KERSPINACH. I am discharged from the National Tube Co. electrical department.

Senator PHIPPS. At McKeesport?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did they discharge you for, and when?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Why, they—the foreman called me in the office twice and asked me if I belonged to so and so.

Mr. RUBIN. Belonged to what?

Mr. KERSPINACH. The union. I say no. Well, they call me Friday evening, Mr. Snyder, he took me, and he say, "Joe, do you belong to the union?" I told Mr. Snyder, "Not yet; maybe I have to go, but I do not yet."

About 6 o'clock in the evening the foreman came in of the night term, and he says, "You get down to the office to-morrow morning and get your money." I say "All right." I went down, and John D. Skelly came down and give me my time. I say, "What for?"

He say, "We do not want you any more."

I says, "Why not?"

He says, "We do not want you any more. We do not want you."

I say, "Why so I get my money? Why am I discharged?" I was discharged because I belong to the union, and I was good for 14 years with the company, when I did the work of two men or three men.

The CHAIRMAN. When was this that you say you were discharged?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Five weeks ago on Friday. I was splice coupler for 56 crane, and they have on the bar crane; they have 20 bar crane; we have 4 cranes under the trolley for safety, and the crane runs up between the girders and a switch, and when you cut that off it goes higher, and when you knock the clamps out it goes lower.

Mr. RUBIN. You say that you did work of two or three men?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And you claim that you were discharged because you joined the union?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You were telling us about an accident on the crane.

Mr. KERSPINACH. No, sir; I was splicer inspector of the crane, and have charge on a big job, when they were lifting some of an armature out and change the big thing and it dropped—

Senator PHIPPS. What was the reason it dropped?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Sometimes they can not help it, because they had the rack over the cranes on the floor and can not pass the load over the rack, and the craneman raised it in a hurry and the little switch it is cut out and raised up more, and knock the clamps out and it go down. They called me down and said, "What do you do?" I said, "I can splice that couple and it be safe and nobody get killed."

Seven years I was on the splicing jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. How long before your discharge was this accident?

Mr. KERSPINACH. This is five weeks now discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there some accident there, something falling?

Mr. KERSPINACH. There was falling, and nobody hurt.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you to blame for that?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No; I was not to blame for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you discharged for that?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No; I was discharged; nobody got killed.

The CHAIRMAN. How long was it after that accident before the time of your discharge?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Oh, it was about pretty nearly four months.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any other reason for discharging you that you know of?

Mr. KERSPINACH. I can not tell you. I have got three children, I have been married five years, and my mother is dead, and I am without a job, and I have got to go to peoples for feeds for my children.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you tried to find work anywhere?

Mr. KERSPINACH. I can go no place, for every place is shut down.

The CHAIRMAN. Won't they take you back?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you tried all of them?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't you try and see if they will take you back?

Senator WALSH. How do you know that you were discharged by reason of being a member of the union?

Mr. KERSPINACH. They told me if you get a letter you don't belong to the union you get the job back.

Senator WALSH. Who told you that?

Mr. KERSPINACH. The foreman.

Senator WALSH. Who is he?

Mr. KERSPINACH. John D. Skelly.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you ready to go to work to-morrow if they take you back?

Mr. KERSPINACH. I do not know if he would take me back.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you ready to go to work to-morrow if they take you back?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Maybe got another man in my place. I am satisfied. I can not live without working, because I have three children.

Senator McKELLAR. How long were you working?

Mr. KERSPINACH. I was working 12 hours at 60½ cents an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you find plenty of work to do?



Mr. KERSPINACH. I can not move no place with the children. There is one up there—

Senator STERLING. How long before the 22d day of September were you discharged?

Mr. KERSPINACH. I don't know. It was five weeks ago last Saturday.

Senator STERLING. It was before the strike?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. It was before the strike that you were discharged?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know Mr. William Z. Foster?

Mr. KERSPINACH. I don't know; maybe I heard the name, but I can not tell you.

Senator STERLING. Had you been discussing the matter of going on the strike with the workmen?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No, sir; I did not want to strike at all.

Senator STERLING. How long had you been a member of the union?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Not very long; just a couple of months.

Senator STERLING. It has been just a couple of months since you joined the union?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Had you taken the matter up of joining the union and going on strike with the men?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No; I would like to have eight hours' work and get better improved good condition.

Senator STERLING. How much were you earning each day in dollars and cents before you struck?

Mr. KERSPINACH. I can not get—

Senator STERLING. How much were you making a day?

Mr. KERSPINACH. For 12 hours, I say for 14—I was paid for 14—about \$8.45.

Senator STERLING. \$8.45 a day.

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir; and I paid \$20 for rent, \$52 for the children, \$50 for myself, and even I go about 4 o'clock I have to close the windows because I can not sleep.

Senator STERLING. You paid \$20 a month rent?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How much does it cost you to support your family, aside from the children?

Mr. KERSPINACH. \$56 for the children, which is for his board.

Senator STERLING. You had something left, then, besides what you paid out?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Not very much. I have to pay insurance for myself—anything happen they would be on the street.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been earning \$8.45 a day?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Not very long; about a couple of years.

Senator STERLING. Were you able to lay up a little money each month?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Didn't you lay up anything out of that \$8.45 day?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No, sir. I can tell you. Five years since I lost my sisters, and I never put up any money in the bank.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you buy a Liberty bond?

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How much?

Mr. KERSPINACH. One hundred and fifty dollars. I was told to buy it; if I did not buy a Liberty bond I would lose my job. I said, "I can not do it; I have to support the children first."

Senator WALSH. How long were you a member of the union?

Mr. KERSPINACH. A part of this year; a couple of months.

Senator WALSH. Did you have a vote as to whether or not there should be a strike?

Mr. KERSPINACH. No; I did not vote for a strike. We tried to have meetings at McKeesport a couple of weeks ago, and I went up there myself, and the policemen and the detectives at McKeesport, what they call—on the horses—

The CHAIRMAN. The constabulary.

Mr. KERSPINACH. Yes; there was about 3,000 people. They got in an American man, and I was with them and I went to stay with them fellows, and the chief of police said, "Keep on." I saw there was a crowd up there of about 3,000 people. I saw in about 20 minutes a fellow come up to the horses and say, "Go ahead." Never in my life was I treated as I was that day.

#### TESTIMONY OF GEORGE F. COLSON.

(George F. Colson was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Did you work in the mill where this superintendent was in charge?

Mr. COLSON. I worked in the mill in 1913, in the nail mill. I drew 17½ cents an hour. I enlisted in the Army during the trouble in Mexico and from there I was sent to West Point Military Academy with a detachment of Engineers, and from there to Washington, D. C., with the First Battalion of Engineers. We were organized and made bigger regiments and I was sent to the Sixth Engineers during the war, and from there I went to France and I was one of the first 50 men that got off the boat—one of the first men in France. When I came back my friends—

Mr. RUBIN. When did you come back?

Mr. COLSON. In March. We landed on March 24, 1919, in New York City, and I laid in the hospital. I was there until April 19, 1919, at Camp Dix, N. J. I came back from there, and I had a mother to support, and I turned around and I went down to the mill and I asked the employment agent for a job. "Well," he said, "you are discharged—where is your discharge?" and I turned around to him and I says, "I am a Regular Army man." He said, "I can not give you no job." He got rough with me and I said, "Don't get too rough. Two men can play the same game." I said, "Mister, I want for a job." He said, "I can give you a job with a shovel and a wheelbarrow, shoveling ashes. You will have to see the superintendent." One morning I happened to get in there about 8 o'clock and I had a little talk with him, and he says, "I can't do nothing for you." I had to look for five months before I got the job. I got a job on the bloom mill. It was one of the greasiest jobs—

The CHAIRMAN. What mill was that in?

Mr. COLSON. The bloom mill at the steel works at Donora, Pa.; and, so far as safety conditions up there are concerned, a man has no chance, because if he ever slips, his hands are greasy and the steps are greasy, and there is no rail, and there is no chance for your life unless you jump out of the window and kill yourself.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever know of anybody slipping there?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; there was one man who slipped and fell off and I got his job. I took his place as millwright helper.

Senator STERLING. And do you know of any others?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; I do. I know a friend of mine had his arm taken off in the same condition. At that time they did not have no safety-first conditions down there amongst the cogwheels with his men, and did not have no place to stand, and that is where they set the cold ingots, and it took his arm off his shoulder. He got him a compensation of \$10 a week, and at the end of two weeks he gets that; he gets a pay day twice a month.

Senator McKELLAR. What pay do you get?

Mr. COLSON. I got 44 cents an hour, but that was not enough, because it costs me nearly \$6 or \$7 for clothes every week. You can not wash them, and we must spend \$6 or \$7 a week for clothes, and it burns the soles of your shoes off, the heat coming up from the furnace, and when the door is up, the cranes are hot and the grease will melt, and you will slip, and it gets very hot.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are there working in that mill?

Mr. COLSON. I did not work there very long, not long enough to get acquainted with them all.

The CHAIRMAN. How many were there in there—how long were you there?

Mr. COLSON. From September 3 up until the 20th.

The CHAIRMAN. Did any of those men go out on the strike?

Mr. COLSON. Every one of them was on strike.

Senator McKELLAR. You went out with them, did you?

Mr. COLSON. I went out with them, because I did not get satisfaction from the company in no way. I had to get down on my hands and knees and ask for a job.

Senator McKELLAR. What job did you have before you enlisted in the Regular Army?

Mr. COLSON. I was in the tool room; and they said, "When you come back we will give you a good job."

Senator McKELLAR. How much did you get before you went to the Army?

Mr. COLSON. Seventeen and one-half cents an hour, \$36 every two weeks.

Senator McKELLAR. And when you came back you got 44 cents an hour?

Mr. COLSON. And longer hours, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you work?

Mr. COLSON. Thirteen hours during the night and 11 hours during the day.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many hours' pay—how many hours did you work before you went to the army?

Mr. COLSON. Twelve hours a day. The Army, we only worked eight hours, you know.

Senator STERLING. But in the mill you worked as many hours then as you did after you come back?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; if we did not make 17½ cents an hour, if we made below that, we had to go below that rate.

Senator STERLING. How old are you?

Mr. COLSON. Twenty-three years old.

Senator PHIPPS. And when you asked the superintendent if he could not give you a job, he told you there was nothing except the greasy——

Mr. COLSON. He said that he had not got a thing with it, to hire me, because he did not know about the jobs, and to ask of the employment agent first. He wanted me to start trouble. I did not start trouble myself because I do not look for trouble, but when it does come——

Senator STERLING. You said this employment agent told you that he could not find your name on the honor roll?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you call the attention of the superintendent to that?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; I called the superintendent's attention to that, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you find out the reason why your name was not on the honor roll?

Mr. COLSON. I told them that myself, that I was a volunteer, one of the first boys to leave Denora for the Army.

Senator WALSH. When was that?

Mr. COLSON. Nineteen hundred and fourteen.

Senator WALSH. And when was it that you spoke of, about the wages that you received——

Mr. COLSON. Nineteen hundred and thirteen.

Senator WALSH. And this increase in price has come between 1913 and the present time?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; that increase came up during the war, if I am not mistaken.

Senator WALSH. You did not work in 1916 or 1917 in this plant?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir; I was in the Army. In 1917 I was in France.

Senator WALSH. Are you a member of the union?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you join the union?

Mr. COLSON. May 4, 1919, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are most of the men in this mill members of the union?

Mr. COLSON. Well, quite a few of them. Quite a few of them are members of the union, and the bosses would turn around and come up through the streets and come into the houses and beck the men to go to work; and when they get them down there they turn around and give them a gun to use in case anybody bothers them on the street. My God, a citizen of the United States is not allowed to carry a gun, but the men that are working in the mill are allowed to carry a gun.

Senator STERLING. Do you mean to say that the men who are employed in the mills are allowed to carry guns?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And do you say that the company gives them guns?

Mr. COLSON. I believe so; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they sworn in as deputy sheriffs?

Mr. COLSON. Some of them are and some are not. I know of one case of a boy coming back from the Navy and he carried a gun. He said that he had a permit from the Navy to carry a gun for four years, but they did not give me any and I was in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe that is so?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir; I do not believe it is so.

Senator STERLING. Did you vote to go on strike?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Was there a regular vote taken in the mill?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; a regular ballot.

Senator STERLING. And were all of the employees given a chance to vote on that question?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Were the Americans employed there given that chance?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know Mr. Foster?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir; I have not seen the man, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you write your name on the ballot?

Mr. COLSON. Sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you write your name on the ballot?

Mr. COLSON. My name was wrote on my union card, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you write your name on the ballot in any way?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; when I voted I dropped it in a box and wrote it on the piece of paper and dropped it in the box, and the crowd was voted in the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a place "Yes" and "No" for you to put a cross after it?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And is there a place to write your name on the ballot?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In how many languages was that ballot printed?

Mr. COLSON. I could not tell you. Hungarian, Slavic, Lithuanian, Polish, American, Italian—I believe that—I am not positively sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you born in this country?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; American-born citizen, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further, sir?

Mr. COLSON. I would like to say, Senator, there is one condition that I do not like very well in Denora—of the superintendent carrying the guns and whisky into the mill.

The CHAIRMAN. Whisky?

Mr. COLSON. And that started a little riot down there.

Senator STERLING. When was that?

Mr. COLSON. That was about a month ago.

Senator STERLING. What superintendent did that?

Mr. COLSON. Johnson, of the works there.

The CHAIRMAN. And it started a riot?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; it started a riot down there.

The CHAIRMAN. Was everybody trying to get the whiskey?

Mr. COLSON. I could not say that; no. I do not drink myself, but I happened to be on picket duty down there myself, and I saw it and stopped it.

The CHAIRMAN. You stopped the superintendent?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; and some of the men saw him. He had a suit case and I tried to grab it, and two quarts fell out and a couple of guns, and the master mechanic come down there, also known as the burgess at the time, and two of the men carried it away.

Senator McKELLAR. Was he drunk?

Mr. COLSON. No; he was not drunk.

The CHAIRMAN. And this was the superintendent of the mill coming in?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you do on this picket? What were you doing?

Mr. COLSON. We were guarding, keeping the men out; we had a right to keep the men from going to work. We were doing that in a nice way; and we would say to them "This mill is on strike, and we would like for you to stay out." A few of them did take the hint and stayed out.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you have done if they had not stayed out?

Mr. COLSON. I would not have done nothing but just let them go by.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any firearms?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir; I carried firearms in the Army for five years.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any club?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you just gave him a hint to stay out.

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; I just gave him a hint to stay out.

The CHAIRMAN. And quite a few took the hint?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; many of them did.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any going around to the homes and talking to the wives about their husbands working or not working?

Mr. COLSON. No; I do not know about the husbands working or not. But the bosses come up and tell the wives, beg the wives for the husbands to go to work.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, did you men go to the homes and advise them not to go to work? Did you do that?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir; we stayed at the mill, at the mill gate, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many of your pickets were there at the mill gates?

Mr. COLSON. Well, we had three on one shift and three on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. And the men who would go to work had to go between the pickets?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do to prevent them from going to work?

Mr. COLSON. Well, we just talked to them in a nice way, told the men that there was a strike on, and what we were striking for.

Some of them turned back and some showed battle, and they had firearms on them.

Mr. RUBIN. How do you know that they had firearms on them?

Mr. COLSON. Because they fired a shot.

Mr. RUBIN. At any of the pickets?

Mr. COLSON. At some of the pickets; yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. They fired?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. None of the pickets were hit?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And they were right close by?

Mr. COLSON. One of the men grabbed the gun and he held it up in the air and took it away and threw it over on the railroad track. One of the mill officials wanted to use a little club; and one of the men would not do any of the clubbing, and somebody threw a brick and it hit the police officer in the face and broke his nose.

The CHAIRMAN. Who did that?

Mr. COLSON. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that all that was thrown?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; but one brick.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that you were explaining to the men what the strike was for?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you tell them?

Mr. COLSON. We told them we are on a strike for eight hours and more wages, and asked them if they were satisfied to go with us, and some said yes, and some said, "Mind your own business," and we let them go by; and we were told to keep law and order; and I stand for that always.

The CHAIRMAN. Who instructed you to do that? You say that you were told to keep law and order.

Mr. COLSON. The burgess of Denora, if I am not mistaken, because he made a speech in one of the halls in Denora.

Mr. RUBIN. Not the strikers.

The CHAIRMAN. And was that your reason for going on the strike, were your reasons an eight-hour day and more pay?

Mr. COLSON. An eight-hour day and more pay and better conditions in the mill.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what conditions did you wish?

Mr. COLSON. According to my estimation, safety-first conditions where I worked were pretty bad.

The CHAIRMAN. You wanted more safety?

Mr. COLSON. We wanted more safety in the mill; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any other reasons for the strike?

Mr. COLSON. Well, the abuse; the foreman abused the men. Of course I was abused, since he handed me the blue slip and told me to get out.

Mr. RUBIN. When was that?

Mr. COLSON. At the Clairton works.

Mr. RUBIN. In 1913?

Mr. COLSON. No; in 1919.

Senator PHIPPS. You told us that when you came back from the Army you went to Denora where you worked then.

Mr. COLSON. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. And you asked for a job?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And you got a job at that time?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir; I did not get a job until five months after, though, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And how did you come to work at Clairton?

Mr. COLSON. I had to go out of that town for a job, and I got fired out of that other place; and so did a friend of mine; and he said all I can do is give you a greasy job. I had to support my mother in some way.

Senator PHIPPS. You did not tell us about going down to Clairton and getting a job there before you went to work at Denora?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. But you went to work at Clairton some time in May or June?

Mr. COLSON. In June.

Senator PHIPPS. And what was your job there?

Mr. COLSON. I was fireman on a crane in a coke oven.

Senator PHIPPS. And you got into trouble there?

Mr. COLSON. No; I didn't get into trouble.

Senator PHIPPS. With the foreman and discharged?

Mr. COLSON. No, sir; we got a new foreman in some way or another, and he did not some way agree with my idea of keeping up steam, and he said I didn't have enough, but I had enough when he needed it.

Senator PHIPPS. And did you always have enough for him?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir; I have 75 pounds or 90 pounds and it won't hold more than 100 pounds of steam; and that was the only reason——

Senator PHIPPS. And that was the reason, because he thought that you were not firing up properly?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That was the cause of the disagreement between you and the foreman?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir. He did not like my face; or I did not like his, I do not know which, as we say in the Army.

Mr. RUBIN. Well, have you finished about that whisky and the shooting?

Mr. COLSON. The shooting; the first shot was fired by Supt. Johnson.

The CHAIRMAN. How long ago was that?

Mr. COLSON. That has not been—not quite a month ago.

Senator PHIPPS. When did they take the suit case from him?

Mr. COLSON. The second day of the strike.

Senator PHIPPS. They took the suit case from him the second day of the strike that had the whisky and the guns in it?

Mr. COLSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Was there a man shot?

Mr. COLSON. Well, there was nobody hurt.

Senator WALSH. Why did not a man have a right to take the whisky into the mill if he wanted to?

Mr. COLSON. I do not know the reason he was taking the whisky in in the first place. Probably he might have got men and got them drinking, and he might have handed him a gun and started a riot or something.



Senator WALSH. And you insinuate that it was to give the men a little nerve?

Mr. COLSON. Well, I do not know what nerve——

Senator WALSH. You do not know what he was using the whisky for?

Mr. COLSON. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know the reason for stopping the man and taking the suit case away from him?

Mr. COLSON. Well, we wanted to find out if he was taking in any arms, like rifles or ammunitions, or something—we did not like that, because pretty nearly every house in Donora has been searched for firearms by the State troopers or deputy sheriffs.

Senator WALSH. Has your house been searched?

Mr. COLSON. My house has not been searched; but they will search a citizen's house, and if they catch a citizen they will fine him \$25 or 30 days in jail.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further?

Mr. RUBIN. No.

I want to offer, in contradiction of the evidence that there is no blacklisting maintained, the following letter:

OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT,  
AMERICAN STEEL & WIRE CO.,  
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 2, 1909.

Mr. HENRY BARREN,  
Newburg Steel Works, Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: Four rod rollers were discharged from Donora the other day for cause. I understand that one of them, named John Brown, has secured work at Newburg. If you find that this is the case please let him out at once.

Yours, truly,

J. W. CARPENTER,  
General Superintendent, B. F. & S. W. Co.

Then there is a little note to the left of the letter reading:

Mr. RALEIGH. Is this man in your employ?

BARREN, Superintendent.

And then it bears the receiving stamp of the mill. I would like to offer this in evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. RUBIN. Nineteen hundred and nine.

Senator STERLING. Haven't you anything more recent than that?

Mr. RUBIN. This was just handed to me after the evidence was heard of the superintendent.

#### TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANNA BANKS.

(Mrs. Anna Banks was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. I am going to ask her husband to stand here beside her. I want to use the wife and I probably will not have to use him. You are married and have a baby?

Mrs. BANKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And Andy is your husband?

Mrs. BANKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you beaten up by the police?

Mrs. BANKS. He will have to tell me, because I don't understand.

Mr. RUBIN. What nationality are you?

Mrs. BANKS. Lithuanian.

Mr. RUBIN. Now, you can talk English. Tell us what happened.

Mrs. BANKS. My husband was in the store and I was waiting on him on Oaks Street, and I was waiting on the corner of Twelfth and Oaks Avenue—

Mr. RUBIN. At what place?

Mrs. BANKS. Monessen. And after I was waiting on him—I was coming after him, and I got a baby, and he had hold of the arm like this [indicating], and we was going home. And after the policeman come after me and grabbed me and gave me a punch, you know. He said, "Who called him a s— of a b—?" And I didn't say nothing; I wouldn't open my mouth, you know, and they took me in the wagon.

Mr. RUBIN. Who took you in the wagon?

Mrs. BANKS. And we put up \$50 bail on me.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you get the \$50 back?

Mrs. BANKS. No.

Mr. RUBIN. Was the case ever tried?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; it was never tried.

Senator STERLING. Was the case against you?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. The case was against her.

The CHAIRMAN. Had she done anything at all?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Nothing at all.

Senator McKELLAR. Had you committed any offense of any kind?

Mrs. BANKS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mrs. BANKS. On the 6th day of this month.

Mr. RUBIN. You are an American citizen?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What were you doing?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I was in the store buying me a box of Camel cigarettes.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you been with her before in the street?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I had just left her in the street with the baby.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you come from?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. The corner store.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you go with her from your home to the store?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How far is that?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. One block.

The CHAIRMAN. And were there a good many people on the street?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. A good many; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And did she wait there for you?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. She was there when I got the package of cigarettes.

The CHAIRMAN. Any crowd around here—was there any crowd there?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. There was a crowd of policemen.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you got back was there a crowd there. a crowd of policemen?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you with anybody on the street or were you alone?

Mrs. BANKS. Just myself and the baby and the lady beside me.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you said anything to the police?

Mrs. BANKS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you call them any names?

Mrs. BANKS. No, sir; I did not say anything to them?

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you not appear for trial?

Mrs. BANKS. We did appear.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the result of the trial?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Why, the burgess told us that the case was disposed of; that we had come too late, 20 minutes after 9.

The CHAIRMAN. When was the case set for?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Between 8.30 and 9.30.

Senator STERLING. What was the charge against your wife?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I could not tell you. When Lieut. Albright was there, he said that he would let her out on \$50, and we paid the \$50 and both went home again.

Senator STERLING. Do you understand that she was fined \$50 or was that the bail money?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. That was the bail money.

The CHAIRMAN. Didn't he tell you when the case was set for hearing?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir; between 8.30 and 9.30 the next morning—the next day.

Senator STERLING. Did you go to the trial?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. We went to the trial.

Senator STERLING. And you got there at 9.30?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Had you been told at what hour the case was to be tried?

Senator McKELLAR. He said that it was between 8.30 and 9.30, and he got there at 9.30.

Senator STERLING. And he told you that the case had been disposed of?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you not inquire what charge there was against your wife?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No, sir. I had seen in the evening paper that she had defied the police with a club.

Senator STERLING. You had seen that she had defied the police with the club—

Mr. ANDY BANKS. And I suppose that that was the charge.

The CHAIRMAN. How much does she weigh?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. One hundred and eighteen pounds; don't you?

Mrs. BANKS. Something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. And about what does the policeman weigh?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I could not tell you. He is a pretty good-sized man.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you any club or anything, or had you said anything to the policeman?

Mrs. BANKS. I never opened my mouth.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you ask for the \$50 back?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. He said, "You forfeit the \$50."

The CHAIRMAN. Did the burgess say that?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What was his name?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. W. D. Stuart, Monessen.

Mr. RUBIN. How old are you—how old was your baby?

Mrs. BANKS. Three years old.

Senator STERLING. Why did you not go and see the lawyers about it?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. This case only came to our attention yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a striker?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Now, Mr. Rubin, a case like that ought to be followed up and a complaint ought to be gotten. Of course, there may be some explanation for it. If there is it ought to be made public, but if there is not, we have got to quiet that condition.

Mr. RUBIN. I am now outlining a plan to institute proceedings against all of these people who committed outrages in the name of the law. As far as publicity is concerned, I will say that we are not getting fair publicity here. The efforts seem to be to tell the men to go back to work and misstatements are made concerning the status of the strike. I have much difficulty in organizing the local forces. We intend to follow up this case at any cost.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any other cases like this?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I know that the State police beat men up on the streets. They will jump out of automobiles and beat them up.

Mrs. BANKS. Another lady had to pay \$50, and she never got it back.

Mr. RUBIN. Who was that?

Mrs. BANKS. I do not know, but she was some kind of a Polish lady.

The CHAIRMAN. Was she taken to jail?

Mrs. BANKS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that?

Mrs. BANKS. They were arrested about the same time, and that other Polish lady was arrested and the other Polish—I do not know the name.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you talk with her?

Mrs. BANKS. I never talked.

The CHAIRMAN. That is something that you have heard?

Mrs. BANKS. I did not feel like talking.

Mr. RUBIN. She was in jail with you, too?

Mrs. BANKS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You were not in jail?

Mrs. BANKS. No; I was in the office.

Senator STERLING. You went on strike on the 22d of September?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And how long had you been working before you went on strike?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. All the time.

Senator STERLING. How many years—how many years had you been working for the company?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. For the Pittsburgh Steel Co. seven years.

Senator STERLING. And what was your particular work?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I was truckman there. I was craneman at first, but Mr. Fraser discharged me, and I got a job as truckman for the same company.

Senator STERLING. What wages did you get?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. \$8.45 a day on the railroad, working 12 hours and paid for 14.

Senator STERLING. Where do you live; in what town?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. 1221 McMahon Avenue, Monessen.

Senator STERLING. Do you live in a rented house?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; I own my house.

Senator STERLING. And you bought that house out of the earnings you had made while working for the company?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How much do you say you made a day?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. \$8.44.

Senator McKELLAR. And out of that you were able to save, were you?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Why did you go on strike?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Just because Judge Gary did not want to give our representatives a conference.

Senator STERLING. That was the only reason?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. That was the only reason; yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you had no complaint to make, so far as the pay that you were getting was concerned?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I had; about the hours and the Sundays off.

Senator STERLING. You had no complaint to make because of the high rent that you paid for your house, Mr. Banks? Oh, you own your house?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. But it was because of other conditions?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I don't have no kick about any conditions, but about the hours and the working Sundays, too.

Senator STERLING. But it was because he would not meet your representatives in conference, you say?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you take a vote in the mill in regard to the strike?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; we took a vote in the hall.

Senator STERLING. You had a meeting for that purpose in the hall?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; the men came in and voted, and they would go out.

Senator PHIPPS. What plant is this?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. The Pittsburgh Steel Co., Monessen, Pa.

Senator PHIPPS. Does that belong to the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; I think it is independent.

Senator PHIPPS. It is independent?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I think so.

Senator PHIPPS. And what has Judge Gary to do with it, then?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I don't know. There is a tin mill that belongs to the Carnegie Steel Co.

Senator PHIPPS. That is in the same place?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. At Monessen?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. All of the mills go in together, pretty near.

Senator PHIPPS. This lodge that you belong to, the lodge of your union, is that for the men that work in the Pittsburgh Steel Co.?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And also for the wire plant that belongs to the American Steel & Wire?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Well, all the people in that town goes in the same hall.

Senator PHIPPS. They all belong to the same lodge?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. They all belong to the same lodge.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you born in this country?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. In Lithuania, governed under Russia.

Senator McKELLAR. How long have you been in the country?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Eighteen years.

Senator McKELLAR. And you are a citizen?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. I do not recall what you said about the arrest of your wife. Did you say that the policeman cursed her or he accused her of cursing him?

Mr. ANKY BANKS. He accused her of cursing him.

Senator McKELLAR. Accused her of cursing him?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And defying him with a club?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. She did not curse anybody, I know, because she was with me all the way down to the store.

Senator STERLING. Were you present when she was arrested?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And was she taken from your side?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Well, she was taken from my side, and she had the baby in this arm and had hold of me by this arm.

Senator STERLING. And you say that you had been to the public store?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. We had been to the store and we were going home from the store.

Senator STERLING. Did you go with her to the station?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; I went after her. They had taken her first, and I jumped in an automobile and went down after her.

Senator STERLING. Did you go immediately after her?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Well, I would have been down to the police station before her.

Senator STERLING. As I understood her, on an aside, she said that she was subjected to rough treatment.

Mr. ANDY BANKS. They pulled her around, two of them.

Senator STERLING. Did they make you black and blue?

Mrs. BANKS. They pulled me down this way [indicating].

Senator STERLING. Have you got any marks on you?

Mrs. BANKS. I have none; I don't have, but I had some.

Senator McKELLAR. They just bruised you some?

Mrs. BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you got no trial, and they took the \$50 forfeit, and they still keep it?

Mrs. BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And they never offered to pay it back?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir; Burgess Stuart is giving them the \$50 back, and I says, "Don't fool yourself; when I want to get it back I will write and get it."

Senator STERLING. What were you people doing on the street?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Most of them that I seen was special officers.

Senator STERLING. Was not there quite a crowd there?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. There was a crowd of women and children.

Senator STERLING. Were there many of the strikers there?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No, sir; I did not see any.

Senator STERLING. What time of day was it?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. It was about 15 minutes to 6 in the evening.

Senator STERLING. And you saw no strikers there yourself?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. There may have been, going up and down the street.

Senator STERLING. You saw no congregation of people there?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Was that about the hour when the people were coming out of the mill?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir; just about the hour.

Senator WALSH. And how long had you been in the store?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I had been in the store about two minutes.

Senator WALSH. And had the officers come up to your wife while you were in the store?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And when you got out——

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I heard her say she was waiting on me; and I took the baby and started up the hill.

Senator WALSH. And the officers while you were inside told her to move on?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; I was right back of her when they told her to move on.

Senator WALSH. Did she make any answer to the officer?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I did not hear her.

Senator WALSH. Then what happened?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. She got me by the arm, and we walked up to the corner of Twelfth and McLane Avenue, and then a policeman came and grabbed her and says, "Who are you calling a s— of a b—?" I was trying to tell the special officers, and he came at me and said, "Look out, you s— of a b—, we will knock your damn face in for you," and the constable started to beat my brother Frank on the arms and legs, and one of the State police struck me with the butt end of the gun, and I said——

Senator WALSH. It looked to you that the officer came up and told her to move along, and the officer asked her if she made some remark, and he came up and overtook you?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know what she said to the officer when they told her to move on?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I do not.

Senator STERLING. Do you know whether she said anything or not?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. I do not know whether she did. All I heard she said she was waiting on me. I was right back of her. The officers knowed I was her husband.

Senator STERLING. How much of a place is this?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Monessen?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. ANDY BANKS. About 20,000 or 25,000, sir.

Senator STERLING. Was this one of the principal streets?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. No; Donner Avenue is the principal street. This is a residential district up the hill.

Senator STERLING. This is in the residential district?

Mr. ANDY BANKS. Yes, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF JOHN YILLAWICH.

(John Yillawich was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. How old are you?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Thirty.

Mr. RUBIN. Are you a striker?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you arrested?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. When? This week or last week?

Mr. YILLAWICH. This week, Wednesday morning, a quarter after 6.

Mr. RUBIN. A quarter after 6 in the morning?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell us what they did to you.

Mr. YILLAWICH. I got in from Aberdeen Avenue in Monessen. I go myself. State constable came and put me in a bunch; there were a couple of fellows in front of me, and put us in a bunch, six men, and took me to tube mill. He put us in the tube mill gate, and it was dark and no lights on it. When they got close to the door they opened the door and opened the lights, too, and put us down in the cellar. No. 1 State policeman go around and ask how old and American citizen and anything, and always ask us. Well them fellows go away. the other fellow said—he stood on the other side—he said, "You fellows are going to be hung about 8 o'clock." I told them, "You already like hell; I don't kill nobody; I don't rob anybody; what for I get hung?" Well, for 7 o'clock come, come a patrol wagon, takes down to jail. Well, I sit in jail until half past 4 after dinner. and my wife come three times that day down there. She said, "John, you go out," she says. "Well, I want to go out; need a \$500 bail." I said, "You had better go find somebody to sign the bail." She go around and get one fellow—he got his property, you know—and sign his name and take me off for \$500 bail.

Senator WALSH. Did you have a hearing?

Mr. YILLAWICH. We don't have a hearing; we don't got much talk; we had to keep the mouth shut.

Senator WALSH. Did you go before any judge?

Mr. RUBIN. Were you in court the next day before the magistrate?

Mr. WILLAWICH. No; I never say—



Mr. RUBIN. Did you go before the burgess?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes; the burgess place.

Mr. RUBIN. And he put you under \$500 bail?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Do you know what charge you were arrested on?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I don't know. He says he put that case in Greensburg.

Mr. RUBIN. He bound you over to the grand jury?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Evidently there was some hearing and they let him out on bail.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you worked there?

Mr. YILLAWICH. For six years.

The CHAIRMAN. You went out on strike?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I went out on strike in 18.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. YILLAWICH. First papers.

The CHAIRMAN. What country are you from?

Mr. YILLAWICH. From Austria; no country now.

The CHAIRMAN. What were you earning when you went out on strike?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Well, I want eight-hour day, more money, and better conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. What were you getting? How much were you getting per day?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I got 64 cents an hour; \$6.49 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. You are striking for better conditions and less hours?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours do you work?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Eleven hours; night 13.

The CHAIRMAN. What conditions do you want changed? What do you mean by better conditions?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Put some more safeties in the machines.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that the machines are dangerous?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Dangerous here; sure.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you lose that finger [indicating]?

Mr. YILLAWICH. About three years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. And how did you lose it?

Mr. YILLAWICH. The machine cuts it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there many men hurt in the mills?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Oh, hell, yes; lots.

Senator STERLING. How many men are there working there in that mill?

Mr. YILLAWICH. The department where I work or the whole mill?

Senator STERLING. Well, the department in which you work?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Oh, 100 men.

Senator STERLING. And how many in the whole mill?

Mr. YILLAWICH. That is where I work; in the whole mill may be 7,000 men.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many are out on strike now?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Oh, pretty nearly all.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you join the union?

Mr. YILLAWICH. April 17.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there a good many men there who belong to the union?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes; I know lots of them.

Senator STERLING. What time in the day was it that these officers arrested you?

Mr. YILLAWICH. When?

Senator STERLING. That they arrested you on the street? Was it in the morning or in the afternoon?

Mr. YILLAWICH. In the morning.

Senator STERLING. How early in the morning?

Mr. YILLAWICH. It was a quarter after 6.

Senator STERLING. It was a quarter after 6?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. How long had you been out?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I had just come out from my house. I never was from my house about 15 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you going?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I tried to go down to the job.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you had your breakfast?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes; I had my breakfast, and I tried to get a train to go down to Braddock. I do not go at half past 6 in the morning.

Senator McKELLAR. What were you going down there for?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Well, my wife's sister is down there.

Senator STERLING. Were these other men going with you to Braddock?

Mr. YILLAWICH. No.

Senator STERLING. How many men got arrested at the same time?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes; altogether. Every one on the side; they put us in a bunch; three State constables come from this way [indicating] and some run away and some club. One fellow fall on the sidewalk, which was nearly 6 or 7 feet high, and she leave that man alone; he will kill himself, the constable said.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know any of these other men who were arrested with you?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you know them before that morning?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes; I know them.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you ever been arrested before?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Never. That was the first time I ever was arrested.

Senator STERLING. Were any of these men going to Braddock?

Mr. YILLAWICH. No; just myself.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know what they were going to do?

Mr. YILLAWICH. What?

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know what they were going to do? You do not know what their business was?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I don't know.

Senator STERLING. Did you have an attorney hired?

Mr. YILLAWICH. No; I never have.

Senator STERLING. Are you going to have one?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I am going to have one.

Senator STERLING. When the case is tried at Greensburg are you going to have one?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes; I am going to have.

Senator STERLING. You voted for this strike, did you?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes; I voted for this strike.

Senator STERLING. Where did you cast your vote?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Whereabouts were you when you voted?

Mr. YILLAWICH. I put the cross.

Senator STERLING. Whereabouts were you when you voted?

Mr. YILLAWICH. At Monessen union office.

Senator STERLING. At the union office?

Mr. YILLAWICH. Yes.

### TESTIMONY OF BOB PONOVIATCH.

(Bob Ponoivitch was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. How old are you?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. Twenty-seven.

Mr. RUBIN. Speak up. Were you arrested last Wednesday?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. In Monessen?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. In Monessen.

Mr. RUBIN. By whom were you arrested?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. The chief of police.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell us what you did and what they did to you?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. I just get on the street to go by the store for Camel cigarettes, and he asked me——

Mr. RUBIN. You went to the store to buy some Camel cigarettes?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Speak louder.

Mr. PONOVIATCH. He asked me, "Where are you going?" I says I was going to buy some cigarettes. He says, "You are going, like hell, and go to hell, and put me down in the tube mill jail."

Senator McKELLAR. When was that?

Mr. RUBIN. Last Wednesday.

Senator McKELLAR. What time of the day.

Mr. PONOVIATCH. A quarter after 6.

Mr. RUBIN. What did you do? Had you done anything?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Was it quite light when you were arrested?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. He opened up the light down in the cellar.

Senator STERLING. You said that it was about a quarter after 6?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Was it daylight when you were arrested?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. It was light down there; he got the light.

Senator STERLING. It was before sun up, was it, when you were arrested?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How long had you been out at that time?

Mr. PONOVIATCH. About half an hour, while I was down in the cellar.

Senator STERLING. You said that you were arrested by an officer at a quarter past 6?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Yes.

Senator STERLING. How long had you been on the street before you were arrested?

Mr. PONOVIICH. I just tried to get on the street—not five minutes.

Senator STERLING. And do you live near where you were arrested?

Mr. PONOVIICH. I live up there.

Senator STERLING. Are you a married or a single man?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Single.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you live with your parents—with your father and mother?

Mr. PONOVIICH. I live with my aunt.

Senator McKELLAR. Were there any young men or boys on the street at that time?

Mr. PONOVIICH. No, sir; I did not see.

Senator McKELLAR. Just you by yourself?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Just me by myself.

Senator McKELLAR. And within five minutes after you came out on the street you were arrested?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you were going for a package of cigarettes?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you had not done any harm or damage to any one?

Mr. PONOVIICH. No; nothing.

Senator McKELLAR. And you were not making a fuss?

Mr. PONOVIICH. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you were not interfering with other people going to work?

Mr. PONOVIICH. No; I didn't pass nobody.

Senator McKELLAR. And you were not talking to anybody?

Mr. PONOVIICH. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And he just swooped down and put you in jail?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Yes, sir. He said, "You fellows, we are going to hang you"; that is what he told me.

Mr. RUBIN. That was up in the mill jail?

Mr. PONOVIICH. That is—he asked me that down at the gate.

Mr. RUBIN. They told you they would hang you, at the mill jail?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Yes, sir; in the cellar.

Mr. RUBIN. How long did they keep you there?

Mr. PONOVIICH. A half an hour or 20 minutes.

Mr. RUBIN. Then where did they take you to?

Mr. PONOVIICH. They took me down to Monessen jail.

Mr. RUBIN. And how long did they keep you in Monessen jail?

Mr. PONOVIICH. About 12 hours.

Mr. RUBIN. Are you out on bail now?

Mr. PONOVIICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. How much bail?

Mr. PONOVIICH. \$500 bail.

Senator STERLING. What are you charged with?

Mr. PONOVIICH. They didn't charge me with nothing. I have had no trial yet.

Senator STERLING. What did they say you had done?

Mr. PONOVITCH. He didn't say.

Senator STERLING. What wrong had you committed? What did they say you had done that was wrong?

Mr. PONOVITCH. Oh, well, I don't know.

Senator WALSH. Were you taken to court before a judge or a magistrate?

Mr. PONOVITCH. No.

Senator WALSH. Do you mean to say that you have not been in court or before a magistrate?

Mr. PONOVITCH. No.

Senator WALSH. Does he mean to say that he was not arraigned when he was given that \$500 bail?

Mr. RUBIN. Have you got a lawyer?

Senator STERLING. I want to find out whether he was in the same company that the other men testified to.

Mr. RUBIN. Yes; he was one of the six that were gathered up.

### TESTIMONY OF MR. ELMER KUSCOK.

(Elmer Kuscok was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Kuscok, how old are you?

Mr. KUSCOK. About 31.

Mr. RUBIN. And how long have you lived in Monessen?

Mr. KUSCOK. About 13 years.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you arrested last Wednesday?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. And what did they do to you?

Mr. KUSCOK. They seed me on the street.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him about the time.

Mr. RUBIN. What time was it?

Mr. KUSCOK. About half past six.

Mr. RUBIN. In the morning?

Mr. KUSCOK. In the morning.

Mr. RUBIN. Where did they take you, and who took you?

Mr. KUSCOK. State police.

Mr. RUBIN. Where did they take you?

Mr. KUSCOK. You know; that cellar.

Mr. RUBIN. The cellar of the company?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. And what did they say to you?

Mr. KUSCOK. They were going to hang me, he said. They asked me if I have got soft hands. Why, yes; I did not work for three months.

Mr. RUBIN. Why didn't you work?

Mr. KUSCOK. Because no can not.

Mr. RUBIN. Are you sick?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. What is the matter with you?

Mr. KUSCOK. An operation about one year ago.

Mr. RUBIN. An operation for what?

Mr. KUSCOK. I got appendicitis.

Mr. RUBIN. And then after they kept you there for half an hour, where did they take you?

Mr. KUSCOK. In the jail, and stayed about 12 hours in there, and got good friends to give bail in \$500.

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Feeney, can you tell us what these six men are charged with?

Mr. FEENEY. It is a common thing in Monessen to just throw them into jail.

Mr. RUBIN. What was the charge?

Mr. FEENEY. They are charged generally with disorderly conduct.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you arrested at the same time with these other two young men?

Mr. KUSCOK. Why, one fellow come from the other side of the street and the other from another, and a couple of men which I never before saw—the men on the street on the morning—I saw even 14 men on Monday and nobody bother them. I saw on Monday 14 men and nobody bother me this week like that. Fourteen arrested on Monday and nobody bother me. I think that nobody would bother me then, either.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What nationality are you?

Mr. KUSCOK. Croatian.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. KUSCOK. Thirteen years—1907—about 13 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you married?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a family?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many children have you?

Mr. KUSCOK. Three.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you marry a girl in this country?

Mr. KUSCOK. No; she come about 10 years after.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you taken out your first papers?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever tried to get them?

Mr. KUSCOK. I get it to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to try to get them to-morrow?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why didn't you get them yesterday? Why did you not get them during the 13 years?

Mr. KUSCOK. Because I have got no time. If I go away, the boss tell me, "Where have you been?"

The CHAIRMAN. Have you thought about getting out your papers before this time?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you want to be an American?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you and your family speak the English language in your home?

Mr. KUSCOK. The children speak in English, and wife and I speak Croatian.

Senator McKELLAR. Your wife speaks Croatian and you do, too?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. How old is the oldest of your children?

Mr. KUSCOK. The oldest one is seven years.

Senator McKELLAR. Does that child go to school?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Does that child go to an English school?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Does that child speak Croatian, too?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir; a little bit; half English and half Croatian.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you and your wife talk English to your children?

Mr. KUSCOK. Some; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not been working for a year?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes; I have been working; working in the steel right along.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you had an operation?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes; I had an operation, but that is the time I did not work, before all right.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you working there up until the 22d of September?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes; I did not work before much that time; I was working—I was getting—they would give me a job, easy job, picking scrap.

Senator McKELLAR. When did you get back to work after the operation?

Mr. KUSCOK. I can not tell that.

Senator McKELLAR. How long before the 22d of September? How many months?

Mr. KUSCOK. About a couple of months.

Senator McKELLAR. What were you getting when you got the work before the 22d of September—how much a day?

Mr. KUSCOK. I got one month and two months.

Senator McKELLAR. How much were you making a day?

Mr. KUSCOK. How many dollars?

Senator McKELLAR. How many dollars were you making a day?

Mr. KUSCOK. Forty-two cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. Forty-two cents an hour?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. For the easy job?

Mr. KUSCOK. That is, for eight hours, and half time for overtime.

Senator McKELLAR. Time and a half for overtime?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you went on strike the 22d of September?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you vote to go on strike?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Where was that vote cast?

Mr. KUSCOK. In the union house.

Senator McKELLAR. In the union hall?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. On the morning of the day you were arrested, do you remember these other gentlemen who testified about being arrested?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes; the State policemen chased them from one corner.

Senator STERLING. Do you know any of these men?

Mr. KUSCOK. No; I was walking like that.

Senator STERLING. Do you know the men who were arrested with you?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know these men who testified?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir; two of them.

Senator STERLING. And you have known them for some time?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. And it was about 6.30 in the morning that you were arrested?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yesterday, about 6.30 in the morning.

Senator STERLING. Was it bright light—daylight—when you were arrested?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes; it was daylight, good daylight, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you had your breakfast at that time?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How long had you been up?

Mr. KUSCOK. I was just getting on the street to go down town.

Senator STERLING. Had you been out after you got up and before you had your breakfast? Had you been out on the street anywhere?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. You had not?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. You had just come out from breakfast?

Mr. KUSCOK. I had just come out from breakfast.

Senator STERLING. Had you seen any of these men arrested the day before?

Mr. KUSCOK. I seen two men who don't go on the strike.

Senator STERLING. These men who were arrested with you, had you seen any of them the day before your arrest?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. How late were you up the night before?

Mr. KUSCOK. I don't understand that.

Senator STERLING. How late did you stay up the night before?

Mr. RUBIN. What time did you go to bed the night before?

Mr. KUSCOK. About 10 o'clock.

Senator STERLING. And what time did you get up in the morning?

Mr. KUSCOK. About 6 o'clock.

Senator STERLING. You went to bed as early as 10 o'clock, did you, that night?

Mr. KUSCOK. I went to bed at 10 o'clock that night.

Senator STERLING. In your own home there?

Mr. KUSCOK. No.

Mr. RUBIN. Where did you go to sleep?

Mr. KUSCOK. In my home.

The CHAIRMAN. What are these buttons you have on your coat?

Mr. KUSCOK. This is society; this is a Liberty loan.

The CHAIRMAN. What is this society?

Mr. KUSCOK. The Maccabee.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is the other button?



Mr. KUSCOK. It is the Liberty loan.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you come to get that? What did you get that for?

Mr. KUSCOK. Buy Liberty bond.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the Victory Liberty loan?

Mr. KUSCOK. I can't explain it.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. KUSCOK. I know; I can't explain it.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you buy the bond for?

Mr. KUSCOK. I bought it for \$100.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you buy it? What for?

Mr. KUSCOK. I have to buy it.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made you buy?

Mr. KUSCOK. I want myself buy; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Why? What was it for?

Mr. KUSCOK. I got interest on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we will have to have order in the room or we will have to go ahead without you people here.

What was the Victory Loan used for?

Mr. KUSCOK. It was to win the war, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. To win the war?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the war about?

Mr. KUSCOK. In France.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. KUSCOK. In France.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what the war was for?

Mr. KUSCOK. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was fighting in this war?

Mr. KUSCOK. So many kings around here I can not tell.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what nations were in the war?

Mr. KUSCOK. You have to count for half an hour the nations in the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Was your country in the war?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay any attention to the war?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any relatives in the war?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you don't know what the war was about?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you volunteer?

Mr. RUBIN. I submit that those questions ought to be put through an interpreter. You might put the questions through an interpreter. I do not think he understands.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to take any advantage of him.

(The following questions were then put through an interpreter:)

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him what he thought his Liberty bond was for; that the money he paid for the Liberty bond was being used for?

The INTERPRETER. He don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. He don't know; is that what he says?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him if he knows what the war was about.

The INTERPRETER. If somebody will tell me I will like to know.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him if he paid any attention to the war.

The INTERPRETER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him if he would be willing to go to war to protect the United States.

The INTERPRETER. He says yes, if I don't have a wife.

Mr. RUBIN. He means that he would claim exemption by that, I suppose.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him the difference between his country and this country.

The INTERPRETER. He says this country is better.

The CHAIRMAN. How is it better?

The INTERPRETER. He can't live there now, because he can't live that way; maybe one fellow got a couple of sons, maybe five or six sons, in a small quarters, and that fellow has not enough ground, you know, on his farm for so many men to live on that farm, and have to go away; that is what is the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask him why he came to this country.

The INTERPRETER. He says you have to go some place.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did he not go to some other country instead of coming to this one?

Mr. KUSCOK. I hear this is a free country and everybody going and I go myself.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by a free country?

Mr. KUSCOK. I can go any place I want and get a job some place, and if I do not get a job some place I get another one and nobody asks about it.

The CHAIRMAN. You think a free country is where you can go any place and get a job?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is what you want?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Ask him if he reads papers published in the Croatian language—his own language.

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir; I do; a little bit Croatian and a little bit English.

Senator McKELLAR. Ask him if he takes a Croatian paper regularly.

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you ever go to school in this country?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How did you learn to read and write English?

Mr. KUSCOK. Write just a little bit.

Senator McKELLAR. You just picked it up by yourself?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You never went to school in this country?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir; only in the old country.

Senator McKELLAR. You never went to school in this country?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Why?

Mr. KUSCOK. Because my father died when I was about a year and a half old, and my mother had to take care of me, and I lived in one house and nobody could buy clothes for the family.

Senator STERLING. What did you do when you were in the old country?

Mr. KUSCOK. Raise some cows or goats or turkeys or something like that.

Senator STERLING. Did you work on a farm?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Are any of your people farmers?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. And had you ever worked in any mill?

Mr. KUSCOK. No; I never saw no mill before I got to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to go to night school and learn about this country?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes; if I have a chance; and I work 13 hours and I have no chance.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had shorter hours would you like to go to night school?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you going to bring your children up in an American school?

Mr. KUSCOK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you talk English at home?

Mr. KUSCOK. We use some English and some Croatian.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the children tell you what they learn at school?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not want your children to go back to Croatia, do you?

Mr. KUSCOK. No; hell, no; I don't.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not want to go back yourself, do you?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir; I don't.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever hear of the I. W. W. in this country.

Mr. KUSCOK. Oh, no; hell, no; I never see nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know what it is?

Mr. KUSCOK. No, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF MR. GEORGE WAKALE.

(George Wakale was thereupon called as a witness, and was duly sworn through an interpreter, and testified as follows:)

(The testimony was taken through Mrs. W. Labinski, interpreter:)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. WAKALE. George Wakale.

Mr. RUBIN. You speak English as much as you can.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us first what is your nationality?

Mr. WAKALE. Slavish.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

Mr. WAKALE. Twenty-four.

Mr. RUBIN. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. WAKALE. Seven years.

Mr. RUBIN. Where do you work?

Mr. WAKALE. I work in the Pittsburgh Steel.

Mr. RUBIN. And are you on strike?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you arrested last week?

Mr. WAKALE. I was arrested last week; yes.

Mr. RUBIN. When last week?

Mr. WAKALE. Monday.

Mr. RUBIN. Who arrested you?

Mr. WAKALE. State police.

Mr. RUBIN. What time of the day?

Mr. WAKALE. That was a quarter after 6 in the morning, something like that.

Mr. RUBIN. Where did they take you?

Mr. WAKALE. He took me in a cellar, there in the office cellar, the cellar down.

Mr. RUBIN. How long did they keep you there?

Mr. WAKALE. About two hours and put me in jail.

Mr. RUBIN. What did he say to you?

Mr. WAKALE. Some guys come over there, down to the cellar, you know, and tell the fellows, he said, "If you go to work, everything is all right; if you don't, you have to go to jail."

Mr. RUBIN. What did you tell him?

Mr. WAKALE. I would like to go to jail, because I am a union man and I do not like to work out on the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did they take you?

Mr. WAKALE. Into the jail.

Mr. RUBIN. Are you out on bail?

Mr. WAKALE. I am out on bail, \$500 bail.

Mr. RUBIN. That is all I want of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any charge against him?

Mr. RUBIN. He is out on \$500 bail.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the charge?

Mr. RUBIN. I do not know. We just got the information yesterday and we have not ascertained it.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. WAKALE. No.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you taken out any papers?

Mr. WAKALE. No.

Senator McKELLAR. Why don't you become an American citizen?

Mr. WAKALE. Because I ain't got no time to put my examination down, because I work 13 hours a night and 10 hours a day, I ain't got time.

Senator STERLING. Do you ever get a day off?

Mr. WAKALE. A young fellow. I like it. I like to work some place in the city and have a good time.

Senator STERLING. Have you learned to read English since you have been over here?

Mr. WAKALE. No; don't learn.

Senator STERLING. Would you like to learn English?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes; I would like to learn English if I go to work eight hours and go to night school. I can learn a little better than I could now.

Senator STERLING. Is there a night school?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you would go to night school if you could get off?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not want to go back?

Mr. WAKALE. No; this is a better country.

Senator McKELLAR. Would you like to be an American citizen?

Mr. WAKALE. Sure! I like to be an American citizen, but I ain't got no examination, and I ain't got no time to learn, and if I have the time I get be citizen.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think it would be worth while for you to take a day off in order to take out your papers?

Mr. WAKALE. I haven't got no pay or board money.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you a family?

Mr. WAKALE. No; I aint got no family.

Senator McKELLAR. How much do you make?

Mr. WAKALE. Sixty cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. Sixty cents an hour?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes.

Senator STERLING. How much do you pay for board?

Mr. WAKALE. \$55 for board.

Senator STERLING. For room and board?

Mr. WAKALE. For room and board.

Senator McKELLAR. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. WAKALE. Seven years.

Senator STERLING. Seven years?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you say there is a night school at Monessen?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And other men who are working in the mills attend this night school, do they not?

Mr. WAKALE. I do not know whether they do or not.

Senator STERLING. You don't know?

Mr. WAKALE. No.

Senator STERLING. Have you ever made any inquiry about it?

Mr. WAKALE. What?

Senator STERLING. Have you asked about it?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes; if I going to get eight-hour work I would like to learn anything. I would like to go to school.

Senator STERLING. How many hours did you work?

Mr. WAKALE. Thirteen hours in night and 10 hours in day I work now.

Senator STERLING. How many days do you work 10 hours a day?

Mr. WAKALE. How?

Senator STERLING. How many days do you work right along, how many days do you work 10 hours a day?

Mr. WAKALE. A week 10 hours and——

Senator STERLING. During that week when you are working the 10 hours, could you not attend night school?

Mr. WAKALE. I work so damn hard I have to take a rest and sleep night.

Senator STERLING. Could not you attend night school for an hour or two in the evening after working 10 hours a day?

Mr. WAKALE. Well, I can not do it. I am too tired.

Senator STERLING. What is your work in the mill?

Mr. WAKALE. I make wire drawing; drawing the wire.

Senator STERLING. You work one week daytime and the next week you work nighttime?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes.

Senator STERLING. You work——

Mr. WAKALE (interrupting). I work hard and can't go to school.

Senator STERLING. Do you know how many are attending that night school?

Mr. WAKALE. Sure I would like to go.

Senator STERLING. How many men are attending the night school, going to night school?

Mr. WAKALE. I don't know, because I don't go over there.

Senator STERLING. Could you not attend that school just as well as the others who work 10 hours a day, when you are on day work?

Mr. WAKALE. Well, some fellow works 10 hours and have a better job than I do, because I do hard job.

Senator STERLING. Does it require a great deal of strength to do your work in the mill?

Mr. WAKALE. Sure I have to work hard.

Senator McKELLAR. And it is a hot place, too, isn't it?

Mr. WAKALE. Sure it is a hot place.

Senator PHIPPS. How many days of the week do you work?

Mr. WAKALE. Some six day and some five and a half days.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you only had to work eight hours a day——

Mr. WAKALE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you could earn enough in that eight hours to live; and then if there were night schools provided you by the Government or through the State government and the National Government, if they had something to do with it, where you would have an opportunity to learn English and to learn about this Government, would you want to attend that school?

Mr. WAKALE. Sure; I would like to learn everything if I can have eight hours work.

The CHAIRMAN. You would like to learn, but you have not had much of a chance with long hours that you have had to work?

Mr. WAKALE. Why, sure, I would like to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

Mr. WAKALE. Twenty-four.

Senator STERLING. Where were you when you were arrested?

Mr. WAKALE. I was down in Wierton.

Senator STERLING. At what time in the day were you arrested?

Mr. WAKALE. A quarter of 6.

Senator STERLING. In the morning?

Mr. WAKALE. In the morning.

Senator STERLING. Were any others arrested at that time?

Mr. WAKALE. I know couple of men arrested at the same time, but the State police block up with one horse in the street and push altogether, and take all of them, seven or eight men, at that time, and he said when I had hearing over at Monessen, you know, he said—he did not say—he said there six of seven men in the bunch. I was only going with that woman as my witness. It was raining, you know. I had them over to one store and the State police come in and chased the people out and put me in the cellar.

Senator STERLING. How long had you been outdoors at the time of your arrest?

Mr. WAKALE. Only about a half an hour or something like that.

Senator STERLING. You had been out of doors a half an hour, and you were arrested at a quarter past 6.

Mr. WAKALE. A quarter past 6.

Senator PHIPPS. After you were arrested and they took you down to the tube mill cellar, were you searched? Did they go through your clothes?

Mr. WAKALE. Oh, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you have any weapons?

Mr. WAKALE. No; I had not got nothing.

Senator PHIPPS. Were any of the other men searched for anything; and did they find anything in their pockets?

Mr. WAKALE. He didn't find nothing.

Senator PHIPPS. They didn't find any bricks or stones or anything?

Mr. WAKALE. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Nothing at all?

Mr. WAKALE. Nothing at all.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you ever take your friends to go to the moving pictures?

Mr. WAKALE. No; I was not in the movie for over one year.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you able, when you went to the moving pictures, were you able to read the signs on the moving pictures?

Mr. WAKALE. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You could not read the notes——

Mr. WAKALE. I can read a little bit, but I do not know what they mean.

Senator McKELLAR. You could understand the notes on the screens?

Mr. WAKALE. No.

Senator McKELLAR. How many moving pictures are there in Monessen; how many are there now?

Mr. WAKALE. I think there is two over there.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, do the boys in the shops go to the moving pictures pretty regularly or not?

Mr. WAKALE. Oh, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. A good many of them go?

Mr. WAKALE. Oh, sure; some of them, who want to spend the money, and I won't spend the money because I have not got that money.

Senator McKELLAR. You have not got enough money to go a great deal?

Mr. WAKALE. No.

Senator STERLING. Does the wife and children go to the movies?

Mr. WAKALE. Some of them go, but my notion is to stay at home.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any churches of your own?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes; two or three over there in Monessen.

The CHAIRMAN. In your language?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They are carried on in your language?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a Greek church?

Mr. WAKALE. It is a Greek church.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you go to church?

Mr. WAKALE. Yes; sometimes, and sometimes when I work in the night I don't go to the church.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these churches largely attended? Are there lots of people there?

Mr. WAKALE. Why, sure.

The CHAIRMAN. And the services are carried on in Greek? What language is used?

Mr. WAKALE. Slavish.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. ANDY PLEVEL.

(Andy Plevel was thereupon called as a witness and, after being duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Now, speak loud, Mr. Plevel. Your name is Andy Plevel?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes; Andy Plevel.

Mr. RUBIN. How old are you?

Mr. PLEVEL. 29.

Mr. RUBIN. Do you live in Monessen?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes; I live in Monessen.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you arrested last week?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes; last Monday.

Mr. RUBIN. What were you doing when arrested?

Mr. PLEVEL. My wife and children; I have a wife and one child, and both sick, and on Sunday evening, and I talk with the wife, and call the doctor in the house. He said she is not so very sick, to wait until the morning and she would go to the doctor herself. About 6 o'clock in the morning, or a quarter after 6, and I went out to try to go to the grocery store first to give the order for what I need at the house. I want to take my wife to the doctor, and when I came down about 20 yards from our store, between our store and the Pittsburgh Tube Mills, I walk myself, I meet two or three fellows and they stop me and say "Don't go down there; there is a constable down there, a State constable down there; and take the people and put them in the jail." I says "I don't care; I got to go to the store."

Two constables were in front with the horses and they stopped me. They said "Where are you going?" I said "I am going to the grocery store and butcher store." They said "What are you doing?" I said "I have to take my wife to a doctor in Charleroi." They said "Go back." They told me I had to do it. When I go up to the gate—

Mr. RUBIN. The gate of the house?

Mr. PLEVEL. To the company gate. I tried to go back; I turned back to take my wife to the doctor. When I came back to the mill gate, I see the constable. They would not let me go to the grocery store, and the company policeman took me and put me in the gate and in the cellar and keep me down there about an hour. I stayed down there and I asked for the tube mill superintendent. I says "Who is the captain here?" He says "What do you want?" I say "I go down to the grocery store and try to get an order, and I have to take my wife to the doctor." He said "We ain't got nothing to do with that. You were arrested by the State constable." After



a while a constable came and took us down, the whole bunch of us back to jail. I was in the jail and my neighbor came down and says "What are you doing here?" I says "I went out to the grocery store and I had to go to the doctor, and the constable, he put me in jail."

He says "What for?"

I says "I don't know."

I says "If I tell that man my wife and child sick: you had better send the doctor."

He says "All right; I will do that."

When we come to the hearing in the squire's office, he says down there "What you doing on the street?"

I told him what I was doing.

"Well," he says "\$500 bail for you."

And my friend says "I will sign the bail."

When he signed the bail for me the constable says "Don't get in the bunch in the street." I was just by myself. I was going down to the grocery store and I wanted to go to the doctor—

MR. RUBIN. Will you, Mr. Brennen, at this point, explain to the committee what this \$500 bail means here?

MR. BRENNEN. Well, that follows a misdemeanor, and the information sets out what the offense is.

Senator McKellar. They are bound to the grand jury?

MR. BRENNEN. They are bound to the grand jury.

MR. PLEVEL. The State constable said "Don't get in the bunch any more; if you do I will put you in the county jail."

I says "I ain't in the bunch to-day. I can't help it."

He says "You just get in that bunch that time."

That is all with me they did.

Senator Sterling. Friend go on your bail?

MR. PLEVEL. Yes, sir.

Senator Sterling. Is he a neighbor of yours?

MR. PLEVEL. He lives about four houses from me.

Senator Sterling. And he had heard that you had been arrested and came down to the jail?

MR. PLEVEL. Yes.

Senator Sterling. And came down?

MR. PLEVEL. Yes.

Senator Sterling. And he wanted to know what you were doing there?

MR. PLEVEL. Yes.

Senator McKellar. How long have you been in this country?

MR. PLEVEL. Twelve years.

Senator McKellar. Are you an American citizen?

MR. PLEVEL. I have the first papers.

Senator McKellar. Are you going to finish it and become an American citizen?

MR. PLEVEL. Yes; I tried to do the best I could the chance—

Senator McKellar. Have you learned the English language sufficiently to read it?

MR. PLEVEL. I ain't got no time to go to church.

Senator McKellar. What work do you do?

MR. PLEVEL. I work in the galvanizing shop of Pittsburgh Steel.

Senator McKELLAR. And how much pay do you get?

Mr. PLEVEL. Sixty-four cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. And did you strike this time?

Mr. PLEVEL. Certainly.

Senator McKELLAR. For what reason did you strike?

Mr. PLEVEL. I wanted better conditions; too many hours for work.

Senator McKELLAR. And what conditions do you want?

Mr. PLEVEL. I wanted eight-hour work and living conditions; make money for living.

Senator STERLING. You wanted eight-hour work and more pay than you were getting?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And how much does your pay amount to in dollars and cents per day? How much?

Mr. PLEVEL. \$7.60 I have to get, day and night. I work daytime 11 hours and nighttime 13 hours.

Senator STERLING. Do you own the house that you live in?

Mr. PLEVEL. No.

Senator STERLING. Do you rent it?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How much rent do you pay?

Mr. PLEVEL. \$15 a month for two rooms.

Senator STERLING. \$15 a month for two rooms?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How many children have you?

Mr. PLEVEL. Just one.

Senator McKELLAR. You have a wife and one child?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How old is that child?

Mr. PLEVEL. Oh, about 13 months.

Senator McKELLAR. Your child is 13 months old?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you been married long?

Mr. PLEVEL. No.

Senator PHIPPS. After you were arrested, were you searched? Did they go through your clothes?

Mr. PLEVEL. No; just myself and the constable.

Senator PHIPPS. No. Did they go through your clothes to see what you had in your pockets?

Mr. PLEVEL. No; when he put me down in the cellar he looked into pockets, but I didn't have anything with me.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you sometimes have to work 24 hours or longer?

Mr. PLEVEL. No; but I have worked 18 hours.

Senator PHIPPS. How many days a week?

Mr. PLEVEL. Well, sometimes six days in the week and sometimes Saturday and Sunday night. You can not tell.

Mr. RUBIN. That is 36 hours at a stretch?

Mr. PLEVEL. And more than that.

Senator PHIPPS. But usually how many days a week do you work, six days or five and a half days?

Mr. PLEVEL. Well. I work six days.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you work on Sunday?

Mr. PLEVEL. The millwork, sometimes we work Sunday nights. I have to change the shift. Over there I would like to work daytime.

Mr. RUBIN. When you change the shift, how many hours do you work without a stop?

Mr. PLEVEL. If I don't work on Sunday night, the nighttime, 65 hours.

Mr. RUBIN. He is meaning the week, I guess.

Senator STERLING. Do you work the same number of hours on Saturday as any other day in the week.

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of this night school?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Do you know that other workmen are attending the night schools?

Mr. PLEVEL. No; I don't know. Of course I don't have no chance to go out. When I work 13 hours I am just looking for bed; not to learn something.

Senator STERLING. But you do not work 13 hours every day?

Mr. PLEVEL. Every other day.

Senator STERLING. You only work 10 hours.

Mr. PLEVEL. One week I work 11 hours.

Senator STERLING. For one week you work 11 hours?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And the next week you work 13 hours?

Mr. PLEVEL. Yes, sir.

#### TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANNA KACHMARIK.

(Mrs. Anna Kachmarik was thereupon called as a witness and was duly sworn through an interpreter, and testified as follows:)

(The testimony was taken through an interpreter.)

Mr. RUBIN. What is your name?

Mrs. KACHMARIK. Mrs. Anna Kachmarik.

Senator McKELLAR. What nationality is she?

The INTERPRETER. Polish.

Senator McKELLAR. How long have you been in this country?

Mrs. KACHMARIK. Fourteen years.

Senator McKELLAR. How many children have you?

Mrs. KACHMARIK. Three.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you arrested last week?

Mrs. KACHMARIK. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. What were you doing when you were arrested?

The INTERPRETER. She didn't do nothing. She said, "I just go to the store." She said that her children were in bed in the morning at that time—it was after 7 o'clock—when she went down to the store, and her children were in bed; and she thought she would go to the store earlier, before the children got up, and the scabs, then they were going to work, about 70, and some one, she don't know where the thing dropped from, either from the hall of the house or some other place; she don't know where the word come from, somebody called them a scab; and she, of course, turned around to her and this other neighbor. They said to the neighbor they wanted to

go across the street, and another woman, a neighbor, made way for her. When she stood there, the men passed to the work. She can't go across anyhow, because they were on the way to the work, and somebody called "scab," and then they turned around to the woman, one and another woman. They pointed their guns to them, the niggers did, and said, "You are a dirty old s—— of a b——; hold your hands up, you white trash; hold your hands up," they called her.

Mr. RUBIN. Who said that?

The INTERPRETER. The niggers.

Senator McKELLAR. To her?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir. And the niggers went all over on both sides and make the two women go in the middle and make her go to the patrol wagon and pointed the guns at them. She said——

Senator McKELLAR. Were these Negroes officers?

The INTERPRETER. She said they are some of them were policemen, and some of them, whoever those to the work, had guns and badges.

Mr. RUBIN. And what did they do? Put her in jail?

The INTERPRETER. Yes. Put two of the women in jail.

Mr. RUBIN. And the other woman, did she have a baby with her?

The INTERPRETER. She left the baby with her mister. The baby was 6 weeks old.

Mr. RUBIN. And how long did she stay in jail?

The INTERPRETER. She said she was in the jail from half past 7 until half past 11 in midnight.

Mr. RUBIN. And then what happened to her?

The INTERPRETER. They didn't anything in the jail, she said; she did not get anything to eat, not a bite.

Mr. RUBIN. And was she taken into court the next day?

The INTERPRETER. She said at 10 o'clock the burgess come to her, Mr. Stuart, and ask her if she is going to pay the \$50 fine, and she told him she didn't have the money to pay that price, what they wanted, and after 10 o'clock she went back to the jail, and at 3 o'clock the hearing was back, and the burgess said—he was over there; they told her to pay \$25 and she says she is not going to pay because she is not guilty to pay the money, and at half past 7 there was another hearing, and they fined her \$5.65, and she said she was not going to pay that.

Senator STERLING. Has she told you that right now?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

And then another woman, she has a baby 6 weeks old, and she wanted the baby, someone to bring her to her, and she is supposed to go back there, and come back home, and some woman; I don't know who she was, they took the baby to her husband, she has got to stay in the jail for the night; and they sent up the \$5.65, he said he is willing to pay to leave the wife and child go home and not leave her in jail.

Senator STERLING. Did that lady tell you that then?

The INTERPRETER. I know that.

The CHAIRMAN. You must tell us what she tells you now.

The INTERPRETER. She told me that before I sit down here.

Mr. RUBIN. Did she pay the fine?

The INTERPRETER. Yes; she paid the fine.

Mr. RUBIN. How much of a fine did she pay?

The INTERPRETER. She paid \$5.65.

Mr. RUBIN. At what time of the night did she pay the fine?

The INTERPRETER. Half past 10.

Mr. RUBIN. Did those colored deputies have a gun?

The INTERPRETER. Every one.

Mr. RUBIN. And how many pointed their guns at you?

The INTERPRETER. More than 10; I did not count any more than 10.

Mr. RUBIN. More than 10 pointed a gun at you?

Mrs. KACHMARIK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did she say that she started out in the morning before her children were awake?

The INTERPRETER. She said she would go to the store before the children gets up.

The CHAIRMAN. That was when she was arrested?

The INTERPRETER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was her husband all this time?

The INTERPRETER. Her husband was with the children home.

The CHAIRMAN. Was she in jail all day?

The INTERPRETER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And into the night?

The INTERPRETER. Until half past 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not her husband come to the jail?

The INTERPRETER. Yes; he was there three times, but he did not have the money to pay the price for her, and then at last he paid at half past 10.

Senator STERLING. Was anybody else arrested at the same time that she was?

The INTERPRETER. That other lady.

Senator STERLING. Were not there any men arrested?

The INTERPRETER. Yes; about 21 arrested.

Senator STERLING. And about 21 were arrested?

The INTERPRETER. Yes.

Mr. RUBIN. And they were all marched down there, were they, between those deputies?

The INTERPRETER. No, no, no; only the two women.

Senator STERLING. What became of the 21 men?

The INTERPRETER. During the day, she said.

Senator STERLING. Oh, during the day. But you and the other lady were the only ones that were arrested at that time?

The INTERPRETER. At that time there were only the two.

Mr. RUBIN. And were they put into the jail with the men, the women kept in the jail together with the men?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And were there any white men among these deputies?

The INTERPRETER. She said the white men did not arrest her, only the negroes, and in the jail there were white and different kinds.

Senator STERLING. Did the colored men go down to the jail with you?

The INTERPRETER. No; they went back to work when they went to the patrol.

Senator STERLING. Who took you to the jail?

The INTERPRETER. The policeman, the one that stands on the corner.

Senator STERLING. The policeman came and took her to jail?

The INTERPRETER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Let us understand. Did you first march down between these colored deputies, pointing their guns at you?

The INTERPRETER. She said she was coming down the hill, and the men was going that way [indicating] on the street, and they heard someone call a "scab," and she turned around and they turned around to her and pointed a gun until the policeman took her away.

Senator STERLING. And they formed two lines and made her and the other lady go between the lines?

The INTERPRETER. Yes; she was in the middle. She said that they said, "Don't go, God damn you; I will kill you right away."

Senator STERLING. Did you stop and wait there then?

The INTERPRETER. She had to stand there.

Senator STERLING. Then did the policeman come to get you?

The INTERPRETER. They took her about three squares to the policeman, who was on the corner, and called the policeman on the corner, and called the policeman and took the two women.

Senator STERLING. Who took her three squares?

The INTERPRETER. They took her in the middle and all marching down the street until they saw the police.

Senator STERLING. And the police took you to jail?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How far was it from there to the jail?

The INTERPRETER. It happened on Ninth Street, and they marched like that to Eleventh Street, until the patrol wagon come. She said while she was in jail there were more men arrested, and she said they brought two men, they were awfully beaten; and she said that man was beaten so bad that he could not stand on his legs, and had three big holes in his head; she saw them with her own eyes.

Senator STERLING. How many people were on the street when she went out that morning?

The INTERPRETER. She said she did not see any people only the people going to work.

Senator STERLING. Did she hear some one call out "scab"?

The INTERPRETER. She said, "Yes; I did; I heard."

Senator STERLING. Do you know where that came from?

The INTERPRETER. She said she did not know where it came from, but it must have come from the house.

The CHAIRMAN. Did she call anybody a scab?

The INTERPRETER. No.

Senator PHIPPS. What time in the morning was this?

The INTERPRETER. It was after 6 o'clock, I said before.

### TESTIMONY OF MR. JOHN BRADA.

(John Brada was thereupon called as a witness, and after being duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Brada, your name is John Brada?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Brada, you run a grocery store and a butcher shop in Monessen?

Mr. BRADA. No; not a butcher shop; a grocery store. I have a little grocery store.

Mr. RUBIN. Where is your grocery store?

Mr. BRADA. On Eleventh Street, the second store up the corner.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you beaten up and arrested last week?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir; Monday, October 6, in the morning.

Mr. RUBIN. And where was that, Mr. Brada?

Mr. BRADA. That was right in the door.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell us what happened.

Mr. BRADA. Just as I went into the store, to open my store, it was about 8 o'clock, and it was raining outside, and the people were going to their work, and it was raining right bad and the people was going to their work and it was raining that early, and when I go to work about 8, just as I opened the door, about four or five men come in the store, and one fellow wanted some tobacco, and another fellow a cigar, or something like that. And just as I got the small change in the pocket, I put it in the register, when I got that ready I went around the bar and I go to the door; it was a nice rain and I see outside about four or five men; and I said to those men, "Step inside out of the rain."

Just as I opened the door I see them outside in the rain, and I said to them "Why don't you come in; it is raining; you are going to get wet." And the State constable stepped up, and he said, "You had better come out of here." I was standing in the door; I was inside. I said, "You had better come in." He jumped on the sidewalk, and he said, "You had better go in." I said, "I am in." He said, "You son of a bitch, get in." Then he knocked me down and everything gets dark and I don't know what it was. I see some stars, and after that I don't know what I am telling him. The next day I was fined; and one man says to me, "John," he says, "if you don't do nothing you can be fined something." Then I began to start the case. I said, "All right."

I went to Queensburg the next Sunday. I started the case, and I not do nothing, I never no talk to anybody. That same day when I got hit on my head the policeman arrested me at the door. And in about 10 minutes he brings about six altogether, and they come right in the store and they take me on the automobile, and another catch my hair, and another push me all around, and they take me down in the lockup.

When I got in the lockup it was about half past 8 and it was about half past 11 or 12 o'clock when my wife came, and they take me to the squire's. Nobody was—nobody was there but the State police and the squire and me and my wife. They would not let anybody in.

Senator McKELLAR. Do I understand you to say that you are a storekeeper?

Mr. BRADA. I had run my grocery store.

Senator McKELLAR. And you are not a striker at all?

Mr. BRADA. No; I have got to work all the time. I have—

Senator McKELLAR. Do you work in the mills?

Mr. BRADA. I worked before in the mills.

Senator McKELLAR. How long has it been since you were working in the mills?

Mr. BRADA. That was about four months I buy that store. I then left the job and started the store. I have got—

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). And the State policeman came and beat you up and knocked you down?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir; just as I say.

Senator McKELLAR. And you say that you saw stars?

Mr. BRADA. Yes. After that I know when I got in the squire's office they make me pay \$6.75 I have to pay and take \$300 bonds.

Senator McKELLAR. And have you gotten that back?

Mr. BRADA. No. I have not got nothing yet.

Senator McKELLAR. What town is that?

Mr. BRADA. It is Westmoreland County.

Senator McKELLAR. And did they charge you \$6.75 for beating you up and knocking you down?

Mr. BRADA. Yes; I had to pay \$6.75, that I pay that to the judge and give \$300 bond.

Senator McKELLAR. And this \$6.75 is possibly a fine for disorderly conduct and the \$300 is bail for your appearance before the grand jury. You had just opened the store that morning?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Were there any men in the store?

Mr. BRADA. No; one man was going past and it was raining outside, and I said "Come in." I know that man.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you use any ugly language or bad words to the policeman?

Mr. BRADA. No.

Senator McKELLAR. Was this man that you asked to come in a striker?

Mr. BRADA. I do not know whether he was a striker or not.

Mr. RUBIN. You just saw that he was getting wet, and you asked him to come in?

Mr. BRADA. Yes. I say "Where are you going? Come in." I know him pretty good. I just went out the door, and nobody was there, and when I was on that side—

Mr. RUBIN. What time was this in the morning?

Mr. BRADA. About 8 o'clock.

Mr. RUBIN. And what time do you usually open the store?

Mr. BRADA. About 8 o'clock.

Senator McKELLAR. You have a scar on the forehead. Did you get that in the mill?

Mr. BRADA. I broke my leg in the mill, and all that I got in the mill. That was about 12 or 13 years ago, something like that.

After I got home the next Thursday I go to Queensburg, and I find out they can not do something. One man got me a warrant, and well I was arrested by that State police—I had that State police arrested.

Senator McKELLAR. You had them arrested?

Mr. BRADA. Yes; I had him arrested and I no do nothing; I did not think he can beat me right under my door. The constable gave him the warrant, and let him know, just that was like Friday when they gave gave him the warrant and let him know, and Friday about 9 o'clock he came in the store, and three policemen come along with a warrant and they took me to jail again.

Senator McKELLAR. And they took you to jail again?

Mr. BRADA. Yes; and I got another \$500 bond.



Senator STERLING. That was in addition to the \$300 that you gave before?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir; that was another \$500.

Senator STERLING. What was the charge against you then?

Mr. BRADA. This time the policeman took me to the squire's office.

Senator STERLING. And they charged you \$500 for swearing out a warrant?

Mr. BRADA. That would be \$800 altogether that I have to pay.

Senator STERLING. What charge did they bring against you the second time?

Mr. BRADA. I don't know. They asked me when I got warrant for him. They got out a warrant for me.

Senator STERLING. Did you have any hearing before you put up that \$500 bail?

Mr. BRADA. I got some—isn't that it?

Senator STERLING. Did you have any hearing before the magistrate or the justice of the peace or the esquire?

Mr. BRADA. I got witnesses.

Senator STERLING. When you put up the \$500 bail in the esquire's office Friday, did the esquire swear the people to tell the story against you?

Mr. BRADA. No; just to signed a bond. I can not see no people from the squire but the State police and squire.

Senator STERLING. I want to get at the facts. Did not the squire take some testimony, swear some witnesses; did he not take some testimony against you before he made you give that \$500 bail? Did not he take some testimony there?

Mr. BRADA. That is what he did.

Senator STERLING. Whose testimony did he take?

Mr. BRADA. I don't know. I do not think it was somebody, that man would sign that bond.

Senator WALSH. Didn't he have—

Mr. RUBIN. He probably waived a hearing.

Senator STERLING. Did the justice of the peace or the esquire ask you if you wanted to have a hearing?

Mr. BRADA. No; he asked me nothing; just sign the bond. That is all he say.

Senator STERLING. You understood that it was a bond for appearance at court for a trial?

Mr. BRADA. That is what I wanted to find out.

Senator STERLING. Did you see any attorney?

Mr. BRADA. When I was in Queensburg.

Mr. RUBIN. To get the police officer arrested.

Senator STERLING. The police officer was arrested?

Mr. BRADA. He was not arrested. He has got to go Tuesday, October 14.

Senator STERLING. To the trial of the police officer?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you have got to go to Queensburg for that?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did he give you a receipt for your bond?

Mr. BRADA. I have not got gothing.

Senator McKELLAR. And you have got no evidence at all that you put up the bond?

Mr. BRADA. No; I can not go out in Monessen; I can not go out in the street and nobody talk to—you make him pay and take him to jail.

The CHAIRMAN. Is your store a meeting place for the strikers?

Mr. BRADA. No; I do not keep any meeting. I have got some pop and some cream and something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do a good many people come to your store?

Mr. BRADA. People is going all the time, passing. I have leaved 15 or 16 years and many people know me.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When were you naturalized?

Mr. BRADA. About three years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the union?

Mr. BRADA. Not this time. I was in the mill when I got in the union.

Senator McKELLAR. When did you join the union?

Mr. BRADA. I worked in the mill when I got in the union.

Senator STERLING. How long ago did you join the union?

Mr. BRADA. About five months. I got four months and I buy the store. When I quit my job I got the store and I saw people come down to the store and I can not chase them out. I have got business. I pay rent every month, \$50 and four-room house.

Senator STERLING. Have you seen anything of the colored deputies around there?

Mr. BRADA. All black fellows this time and police and everything.

Senator STERLING. Are there many of those colored men deputies?

Mr. BRADA. Lots of them.

Senator STERLING. Are they working in the mills?

Mr. BRADA. All of those fellows can go and the white fellows can go out on the street.

Senator STERLING. Did you see any guns in the hands of the deputies?

Mr. BRADA. That is what I saw, they have got some and they have got a badge.

Senator STERLING. But you did not see any guns in the hands of the black men?

Mr. BRADA. No; I no see that. I see what the State police have, and the State police have them, but I do not see the black fellows. Right along my store I do not think very many men can get that way.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a telegram from the chairman of a committee of the Board of Trade, Mr. Scott, who wants to be heard. How much longer do you want?

Mr. RUBIN. I will say, Mr. Chairman, if the Senators do not care to make inquiry into collateral matters, I will get through in less than an hour.

#### TESTIMONY OF RUDOLPH DRESSEL.

(Rudolph Dressel was thereupon called as a witness and having been first duly sworn testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Are you a hotel keeper at Homestead?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you beaten up and arrested?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Tell the committee about it.

Mr. DRESSEL. I was standing outside the front of my business talking with a friend of mine, and a State constable rode up and down, and in one minute he went over to where there were just a couple of fellows over there, and he told them to move on, and he told me to move inside my business. He would not give me time. He hit me twice on the arm and the shoulder, and the shoulder is sore yet. So we moved inside and my friend went in, and he said to my friend, he asked him what he was doing, he came and he looked over the small door, and he asked my friend, "What are you looking for?" My friend said, "Nothing." So he turned off his horse, and my friend he got beat up, too, for nothing, and he went in the next room and he hit him also.

Mr. RUBIN. Did he go into the hotel with the horse?

Mr. DRESSEL. He tried to go into the hotel with the horse, but the horse did not go in.

Mr. RUBIN. He walked in?

Mr. DRESSEL. He walked in with the horse, and the other constable followed him also, and he took my friend out and had him arrested.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you arrested, too?

Mr. DRESSEL. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. How many times did he hit you?

Mr. DRESSEL. Twice, over the shoulder and the arm.

Mr. RUBIN. And did he hit the other fellow when he had him arrested?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. When was that?

Mr. DRESSEL. The second day of the strike.

Mr. RUBIN. That was the 24th day of September?

Mr. DRESSEL. The 24th, I believe.

Mr. RUBIN. And what did you do, if anything?

Mr. DRESSEL. Well, we asked for a transcript; my friend got fined by the burgess up in Homestead, by Burgess McGuire.

Mr. RUBIN. This is the party whose picture you saw in the Tribune cut yesterday, or the New York Times, this man beaten up when the horse tried to get into the hotel, and the horse had more sense than the constable, and the constable got off the horse and went in.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he do? What were you doing?

Mr. DRESSEL. I was in the bar. The constable went in and he went up to my friend and he hit him over the arm. He went up and he pulled him out and had him arrested. We went up there and he was asked—he said, "Please ask my witnesses; I don't know what I was arrested for." The burgess said, "We have not any time to hear witnesses." My friend says, "All right, I will take it up," and he says "I want a transcript" to the court. The court said he had no time to give a transcript here. I went up the next day and paid for the transcript, and he would not give it to us either. We went up the third time more and we could not get it. We went to a lawyer, Mr. Mercer, of Pittsburgh, and we told him about it, and he went up to McGuire, and he has an office in the same building, and he got the transcript of him.

Mr. RUBIN. You understand that the transcript is necessary for the purpose of perfecting an appeal.

Senator STERLING. How much was he fined?

Mr. DRESSEL. Ten dollars and costs.

Senator STERLING. And you were not arrested at all?

Mr. DRESSEL. I was not arrested at all. I just come down to see who the State constable was. He was standing in front of my place.

Senator STERLING. What time of day was that?

Mr. DRESSEL. About 6 o'clock in the evening.

Senator STERLING. Were there many people on the street?

Mr. DRESSEL. There was hardly anybody there.

Senator STERLING. How was your hotel situated with reference to the main travel street?

Mr. DRESSEL. It is on the side street. My hotel is on the street, on Dixon Street.

Senator STERLING. Were there any strikers around there?

Mr. DRESSEL. No, sir; no strikers at all.

Senator STERLING. Was there anybody else around there except yourself and this other man?

Mr. DRESSEL. There was two others at the next corner, about 8 feet from here.

Senator STERLING. Were you talking at all with the other men?

Mr. DRESSEL. No, sir; my friend and I—

Senator STERLING. Did you know the other men?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes, sir; I know them well, my friend and myself.

Senator STERLING. Were they interfering with anyone in any way?

Mr. DRESSEL. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. They were not arrested?

Mr. DRESSEL. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. And they were standing there talking together?

Mr. DRESSEL. They were standing there talking together, and my friend and I was talking together about 8 feet apart. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you naturalized or were you born here?

Mr. DRESSEL. Well, for the last 26 years—I have been in business for 25 years.

The CHAIRMAN. What country did you come from?

Mr. DRESSEL. Germany.

Mr. RUBIN. How long have you had that hotel?

Mr. DRESSEL. Sixteen years.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been naturalized?

Mr. DRESSEL. Twenty years.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you something: Are you familiar with the laws of Germany?

Mr. DRESSEL. Not much. I came over when I was 24 years old, and I was back over there, but after that short time I came over to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the people in Germany compelled to learn the German language?

Mr. DRESSEL. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the people can not stay in that country unless they learn the German language, can they?

Mr. DRESSEL. They have to go to school eight years.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long does a person who comes in there from another country—how long before they compel them to get out of the country if they do not learn the German language?

Mr. DRESSEL. Oh, they do not force anybody to learn the language.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not force them to learn the language?

Mr. DRESSEL. Not in my time; that was 28 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about it?

Mr. DRESSEL. Well, during the war I did not get no letter from there. I have sisters and brothers over there, and when the war was on I did not get no letter.

The CHAIRMAN. But those who come into Germany, they do have to learn the German language, don't they?

Mr. DRESSEL. Well, just the same as in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that they do?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You learned it, and a great many people out in your town can not speak the English language at all?

Mr. DRESSEL. Do you mean in Germany?

The CHAIRMAN. No; in Homestead. Are there not many people at Homestead who can not speak the English language at all?

Mr. DRESSEL. Well, they do learn English as soon as they can. Most of them have not really the time to go to school.

Senator STERLING. This, you say, is a picture of the things as they were at the time of the arrest?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And I understood you to say that yourself and your friend and two other people were on the street, on the next corner?

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes.

Senator STERLING. But I see that this picture shows that there are several people there, near where you stood at the time the constable assaulted you, as I see it. There are several across the street on the opposite corner and there are several to be seen on the corner diagonally across from where you were. Is that a true picture, do you think?

Mr. DRESSEL. So far as I know. I didn't look the thing over. We did not pay no attention around there. My friend turned around, and he told us to move, and I said, "All right." They did not give me time to move, and he hit me twice over the arm and shoulder.

Senator STERLING. But I see in the picture the horse has his front feet up on the sidewalk and the hind feet in the street.

Mr. DRESSEL. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Did the horse get nearer to the entrance of the hotel?

Mr. DRESSEL. Pretty soon I turned around and the horse would have come in, but he could not force the horse to go in, or the horse could have gone in.

(Thereupon at 6.37 p. m. a recess was taken until 8 o'clock p. m. of the same day.)

#### AFTER RECESS.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, and the following proceedings were had.

## TESTIMONY OF MR. J. L. BEAGHEN.

(J. L. BEAGHEN was thereupon called as a witness, and, after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. How old are you?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Forty-nine.

Mr. RUBIN. And how long have you been a resident of Pittsburgh?

Mr. BEAGHEN. About 17 years.

Mr. RUBIN. And what is your trade?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Bricklayer.

Mr. RUBIN. And what office, if any, do you hold in the labor circles in the city and State?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I am president of the Bricklayers' Union local and vice president of the Central Labor Union and American Federation of Labor organizer.

Mr. RUBIN. Are there any other offices that you hold?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I was president of the State Bricklayers' Association for three years and I was a representative for the international for some years.

Mr. RUBIN. Since you have been interested in this steel organizing campaign, how many times have you been arrested?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Eight times.

Mr. RUBIN. And how many times have you been fined?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I was fined all but once.

Mr. RUBIN. And that one time what happened?

Mr. BEAGHEN. We had a hearing before the deputy burgess of Braddock, and the deputy burgess refused to take the case, and we were handed back our money, and it never came to a trial.

Mr. RUBIN. What were you arrested for?

Mr. BEAGHEN. By attempting to hold meetings and establishing the right to speak when we could not get permission.

Mr. RUBIN. And were these meetings that you attempted to hold before this strike?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir; all of the arrests were before the strike.

Mr. RUBIN. All of the arrests were before the strike?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Will you please name the cities in which you were arrested?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Braddock, once; in Clairton, once; in Duquesne, twice; in McKeesport, twice, and Homestead, twice.

Mr. RUBIN. And how long did they keep you in jail in each instance?

Mr. BEAGHEN. In Clairton they kept us 3 hours and 20 minutes before they would accept bail; and the trial was on Wednesday following that I was arrested, and I was fined \$10. At Duquesne they kept me 3 hours in jail and on both occasions I put up \$100 forfeit. The first meeting was on Monday following the Saturday which we were arrested. That was on September 1, and I was fined \$100 and costs.

Mr. RUBIN. That was in Duquesne?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And what did the mayor say to you?

Mr. BEAGHEN. On that occasion he browbeat as much as he could in decency without cursing me; and when he come to fine me, he says, "I will give you \$100 and costs or days in jail; that is all I can give you."

The next Monday I was up again on the same charge, on another charge of an attempt to hold a meeting on lots. We had secured the permission of the owner of the lots to hold the meeting; and he again fined me \$100 and costs, and said that that was all that he could give me, and if he had his way about it he would give me 99 years in the penitentiary, and when I come out he would give me 99 more.

Mr. RUBIN. When was that?

Mr. BEAGHEN. That was on the 8th of September.

Mr. RUBIN. And is the brother of that mayor the president of one of the steel mills?

Mr. BEAGHEN. He is at the McKeesport Tube Co., or some tube company out there. In McKeesport, on the occasion of the first arrest, we were closed out of a hall by the mayor after holding meetings for several months, and they would not allow us to hold the meetings as per schedule, and we asked the permission of the mayor to tell the men to go home, to tell them that there would not be any meeting, and he would not grant that; and we attempted to do that anyway, and Mr. Foster and I was arrested and fined \$10 and costs. That night they would not allow us to tell the men to go home, and the men march down to the jail, and on account of the occurrence, the next day there was a riot. Some people were held in heavy bail. There were 40 arrests.

On the next occasion we were then denied permission entirely at McKeesport, and we could give the permission to hold meetings on some odd lots outside of McKeesport, and we had the men come out there, and on Sunday the State constabulary and the deputy sheriffs broke up the meeting, and the next day we went outside to hold another meeting, and it was raining, and the men went out there with umbrellas. Probably 2,000 men were out there, and they were waiting for their meeting in the mud; and I went out there to attempt to tell them to go home, and I was arrested by a plain clothes officer who walked up to me when I was with the strikers on the street, and he said, "Will you walk to the station with me, please?" I did, and they put me in the office until the chief came down. The chief said, "Lock him up and take \$100 off of him." I had to lay in there two hours before I could get word out that I was arrested. The next morning I was fined \$100 and costs for simply being in the city of McKeesport.

The alderman in hearing the case the next day asked us if we did not know that we were not wanted in McKeesport, and if we came back, the next time he would get a stronger dose. He said that that was all the ordinance would stand for, and he could not give us any more.

In Homestead, when we could not get permission we attempted to speak in the streets, and we were arrested and fined \$1 and costs.

Mr. RUBIN. When was that?

Mr. BEAGHEN. That was back in July; one of the first arrests made; but they had given me permits for a while in Homestead, and

then we were closed out of halls; and when we attempted to explain to them one night the reason that we could not get a hall, the burgess had stopped our permits, we were arrested again and we were fined \$200 and costs.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you ever arrested before?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir. The question of the rights—that was in the boroughs, but in the city here the authorities have seen fit now to close down our halls and drive us into one meeting hall, the Labor Temple, and it won't hold one-third of the men who try to get in there, and we have to rent other halls in the building, and they have denied us permits all around; and I have been arrested in Pittsburgh and denied our rights, and we can not hold a meeting anywhere—

Mr. RUBIN (interrupting). You have charge of the speakers, do you, Mr. Beaghen?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And you had charge of the speakers for a long time before the strike?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Will you tell the Senators what instructions you have given your speakers to impart to the audience their duties as citizens, subjects in this country, and obedience to law and order, and so on?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Well, it has got to be a regular routine of business. Every organizer understands that he is supposed to counsel law and order and try to get along with the police or sheriffs, whoever has charge, whether they want to get along with us or not; and we have put up with a good deal of abuse from some of the officers, especially in the boroughs. Men can not be allowed to show what kind of mettle they are made up, but must take the abuse of the officers. If we get the permission of the local authorities in the boroughs around here, we have got to go and see the sheriffs; and if the local officials decide to change our hours, we have to get a notice over here, or else the sheriff closes us up; and he wants at least 24 hours' notice; and we are just jumping around like a bubble on the water, trying to hold our meetings. We can hardly tell the men where they are going to hold the next meeting.

Mr. RUBIN. In the meetings that were held, was there always an American flag displayed, and were the people told about their duty and their allegiance to this country?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Absolutely; every place we go. That is a part of the address that the organizers are permitted to give to the men. We lay great stress upon that.

Mr. RUBIN. That is all.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been an organizer, Mr. Beaghen?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Why, I have been working at it, just on this occasion, since April, and I have been working at it more or less for 10 years.

Senator STERLING. You have been organizer for different unions?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you never worked in the steel mills, did you?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Oh, yes.

Senator STERLING. Have you?



Mr. BEAGHEN. Oh, yes.

Senator STERLING. How long has it been since you worked in the steel mills?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Why, about two years ago. In changing these jobs around there was a part of the time that I had to work at the trades for six months or a year, until the changes got made.

Senator STERLING. Were you ever discharged from the mills?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No; the only work I ever done was for a contractor under union conditions. You understand that the mill people won't recognize the union and would pay the union conditions, but when they can not get men enough they will go to the union contractors and employ the men and get the work done in that way.

Senator STERLING. You spoke about these different places at which you were arrested, and you named Braddock, Duquesne, Homestead, Clairton, and what others?

Mr. BEAGHEN. There is only the six cities where I was arrested—Braddock, Clairton, Duquesne, Homestead, and McKeesport.

Senator STERLING. When were you arrested at Braddock?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Well, I can not give the date now. It was early in the campaign; about the middle of the summer; about July sometime.

Senator STERLING. And you were at Braddock for the purpose of organizing a union there, or were you there to address union men?

Mr. BEAGHEN. We asked the burgess for permission and he refused it.

Senator STERLING. For what?

Mr. BEAGHEN. For a hall to hold meetings in, Senator; and on his refusal he told us to get the petitions of the citizens of Braddock, at least 20, I think; and we got the petition with upward of 100 on it, and then he refused. And then we went out in an automobile and tried to speak one Sunday afternoon in the street; and they ran six or seven of us in, and we put up a \$10 forfeit.

Senator STERLING. And that was after you had been refused a permit to hold a meeting in Braddock?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And still you proceeded to hold your meeting?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. In spite of the refusal?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And it was within the power of the burgess to refuse permission—

Mr. RUBIN. I challenge that.

Senator McKELLAR. I am asking him now. I want to know, although I may be wrong.

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. You went to the burgess in the first place to get that permit?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And he declined to give you a permit, and said if you got a petition signed by 20, that permission would be given?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you got that petition, and more than 20, and he still refused?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And you had notice from the burgess then that no meeting would be allowed to be held?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir; but we believed we had the right to speak.

Senator McKELLAR. That was last July, you say?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I believe so.

Senator STERLING. And that was during the campaign preceding the strike, wasn't it?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir; it was months before the strike. It was before it was spoken of or debated on.

Senator STERLING. And in Duquesne. You say that you were arrested in Duquesne twice?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What was the first occasion?

Mr. BEAGHEN. It was on August 30.

Senator STERLING. And that was the campaign preceding the strike—when that was on, was it not?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Had you asked for permission?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir. I had not personally, but our men had on several occasions.

Senator STERLING. And permission was refused?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Absolutely, positively; he would not allow anyone to speak.

Senator STERLING. And did you seek, notwithstanding the refusal, to hold a meeting in Duquesne?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I did not get it.

Senator STERLING. And did you try to hold a meeting at Duquesne, notwithstanding the refusal?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes; we went to the owner—I went personally to the owner of some lots; and these lots were down in a section where there is no pavement, the streets are not paved or anything, and we got permission from the owner to hold meetings on the lots, and when we went there—we were holding the meeting—the officers came there; there was about 35 or 40 policemen, and they got everybody out of the mill, everybody they could gather up, and we were charged with blocking the street, and they would not allow them on the lot.

Senator STERLING. Those lots were within the city limits, were they?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you had been refused permission by the—

Mr. BEAGHEN (interrupting). By the mayor of Duquesne.

Senator STERLING. And was that substantially the same situation the second time?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir; practically the same thing.

Senator STERLING. You attempted to hold the meeting after a refusal of permission?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know whether other public meetings were allowed to be held in either Braddock or Duquesne at that time?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Why, I do not know. I was not interested in that enough to pay any attention to it, but I have never heard of any being refused.

Senator STERLING. Who was in company with you when you attempted to hold the meetings?

Mr. BEAGHEN. The first arrest at Duquesne, John McGee, a member of the bricklayers, was with me; and on the second occasion Mother Jones and Mr. Foster and myself were arrested and taken to jail, and another organizer by the name of Patterson came up to see what the bail was and he was arrested, too; and he was held on \$100 bail for trying to find out what our bail was.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Foster was with you, was he?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Was he with you on more than one occasion when you were refused permits?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Not when we were refused the permits was he with me.

Senator STERLING. How long have you known Mr. Foster?

Mr. BEAGHEN. About a year.

Senator STERLING. Had you known anything about his antecedents before this last year?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No; but I heard a great deal about them.

Senator STERLING. You heard about his being an I. W. W.?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I did not hear about his being an I. W. W., but I heard that he—

Senator STERLING (interposing). Do you know anything about any of his writings?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I saw a copy of his book.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever see the book called "Syndicalism"?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Or his other book—

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Don't you know what his sentiments have been as to the I. W. W.?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Only from hearsay.

Senator STERLING. Suppose, Mr. Beaghen, you had known at the time that Mr. Foster had written a book called "Syndicalism," in 1913 or 1914, and that book advocated an industrial revolution and practically overthrow of our system of government, would you, if you believed that Mr. Foster was entertaining those views at the time you were with him in this organization work, have gone on with him in the work?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Why, if I was interested—Senator, may I give you my view of that position?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. BEAGHEN. In fact, I used to be a radical myself before I became in a place where I was assuming any authority in the organization. I used to think that the heads of the organization were too conservative; but as quick as I found out the work of these people, and became acquainted with some of the people, I merely drew in my horns and was not so radical, because I believed I had something else at stake, and I believe I would have felt the same way—at least would have given Brother Foster a chance, but I have made a good personal study of him and his method of carrying on business—I

would have made such a study before I would agree to go along with him, but I am satisfied that he is on the level.

Senator STERLING. Now, Mr. Beaghen, you having been refused permission to hold meetings at these various places by that very authority to whom you applied for permission, would not you have reason to believe that if you attempted to hold those meetings, in spite of that refusal—not saying whether the refusal was right or wrong—would not you have reason to believe that trouble would result?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Would you have reason to believe that there might be an arrest made of the parties attempting to hold meetings in spite of the refusal?

Mr. BEAGHEN. When it comes to the trouble, I knew that there would be no trouble from anyone from the meetings; we never had any trouble anywhere.

Senator STERLING. But the very authority to whom you applied for permission having refused the permission, did not you think that they would resist—

Mr. RUBIN (interrupting). Must we ask permission of the mill owners?

Senator STERLING. It is a question of the properly constituted authorities to whom you applied and not a question of the mill owners.

Mr. RUBIN. Is not a brother of the mayor a president of a mill?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That has nothing to do with it. I am asking the question to whom he applied; and they apparently applied to the proper city authorities. They denied him the permission—

Mr. RUBIN. I would not think much of his citizenship if he would submit to any such ruling.

Senator STERLING. There is another remedy, probably, than to resort to the holding of the meetings, which in all probability would be resisted, and where violence and injury might result. That is the proposition involved. When were you at Homestead?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I was there along in August.

Senator STERLING. And you were arrested twice at Homestead?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And under similar circumstances to those under which the arrests had been made at Duquesne and Braddock?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Practically similar.

Senator STERLING. In other words, permission had been asked?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And the permission had been refused?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And then you attempted to hold the meetings notwithstanding that refusal?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir; but, Senator, when we went to court, when we had our hearings on the Homestead cases and when the burgess of McKeesport was brought up on the same thing, he told the judge that he did not have any license to refuse a permit.

Senator WALSH. How many of these meetings have been held in these communities before there was any strike?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Hundreds of meetings were held before there was any strike.

Senator WALSH. And how many meetings have you attempted to hold without permission, without any license, and how many were held in communities where there was no strike on?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Before the strike, Senator?

Senator WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BEAGHEN. Hundreds of them.

Senator WALSH. So that all of your arrests related to an attempt to hold meetings in industrial communities where there was no strike or dispute or appearance of disorder?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir. In Homestead we went up the street and held three meetings unmolested, and the fourth meeting we were arrested, and then after that he gave us permission if the hall owners would give us the hall, and we attempted to hold another one.

Senator WALSH. Was a strike vote being taken during this period of time?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. When was the strike vote taken?

Mr. BEAGHEN. It was taken later; it was taken in September—the latter part of August.

Senator WALSH. I thought that you began to take it in July.

Mr. BEAGHEN. No; I think it was later than that. I can not just tell the date.

Senator WALSH. Have you seen any disorders at all since this strike began?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir; there has been no disorder, only when the State constabulary raided us at McKeesport and broke us up there.

Senator WALSH. And that was a meeting that some one has testified to here?

Mr. BEAGHEN. Yes, sir; we never had any disorder at any of the meetings unless the police broke in.

Senator STERLING. Do you know the president of the McKeesport Tin Plate Co., who you say is the brother of the mayor of Duquesne?

Mr. BEAGHEN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. And the McKeesport Tin Plate Co. is an independent company, is it not?

Mr. BEAGHEN. I do not know, but I understand it is.

### TESTIMONY OF MR. FRANK GAINER.

(Frank Gainer was thereupon called as a witness and, having been sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Gainer, where do you live?

Mr. GAINER. I live at Roscoe, Pa.

Mr. RUBIN. Mr. Gainer, were you at one time employed as a special police by any of the mills near here?

Mr. GAINER. Last June, one year ago, I was employed by the Pittsburgh Steel Co. as one of their special police.

Mr. RUBIN. And how long were you one of the special police?

Mr. GAINER. Twenty-five days.

Mr. RUBIN. And what instructions did you receive in reference to spotting union men?

Mr. GAINER. I received instructions from the captain of the police to keep my eye peeled around and try to see if I could see anybody creating any agitation or trying to advocate unionism in the mills.

Mr. RUBIN. And what have you to say about Negroes?

Mr. GAINER. During that June, one year ago, there was—the Pittsburgh Steel Co. was bringing many southern Negroes from the South; and they had—they built a number of houses inside of the mill yards, and they would bring them into the mills, and they would tell me to keep my eyes peeled around to the different employees and report to the foreman their actions and what they were doing, and they would put one of these Negroes on his job. They used to bring those Negroes in at night. They would take them off the train at West Newton, on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad on the Youghioheny River, and they would bring them in. They said that they did not want no complaints from the citizens or people of Monessen, especially from these—what they called “these damned preachers.” Those niggers were brought in there for the sole purpose of taking the men’s jobs who were creating agitation or would speak their convictions in the mills. At that particular time the war was on, and there was quite a scarcity of labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all of that witness?

Mr. RUBIN. That is all.

Senator WALSH. Who was the man that hired you to do this work? What was his name?

Mr. GAINER. I say I was hired in the city of Pittsburgh by a man by the name of Mr. Conroy.

Senator WALSH. What was his occupation or position? Was he a police officer?

Mr. GAINER. He is at the present time; at the present time he has an office in the House Building, city of Pittsburgh, corner of Smithfield and Market Streets.

Senator WALSH. Who is he? What is the sign on the door of his office? What does he do?

Mr. GAINER. He is what I term the superintendent of the police department of the Pittsburgh Steel Co., and also the Pittsburgh Steel Byproduct Co.

Senator WALSH. Is he the head of their secret service department or police department?

Mr. GAINER. I presume that he is at the head of the secret service and also the police department, because the captain worked under his instructions.

Senator WALSH. The captain? Do you mean the captain at the mill?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. He has nothing to do with the city or the town police or the county police; is that true?

Mr. GAINER. I do not know that he has individually, no.

Senator WALSH. Now, then, you worked for this steel plant at this time?

Mr. GAINER. Yes.

Senator WALSH. And who asked you to go and see this man?

Mr. GAINER. Mr. Conroy.

Senator WALSH. He came to see you at the mill? How did you know that he wanted you down at his office?

Mr. GAINER. At his office?

Senator WALSH. You went to him and asked for employment, or did he come to you?

Mr. GAINER. I met him in Murphy's Hotel, across the street, and he asked me what I was employed at.

Senator WALSH. Did you have an engagement to meet with him, or did you meet him accidentally?

Mr. GAINER. No; I met him accidentally. He asked me what I was employed at, and I told him I was doing nothing at the present time. He says to me, he says, "Why not come up to Monessen and work for me?" And I told him that I did not think that job was suitable to me.

Senator WALSH. How did you know what the job was, if you had never seen him before?

Mr. GAINER. Oh, I met him on numerous occasions.

Senator WALSH. You knew each other, did you, Mr. Gainer?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And you knew what his position was?

Mr. GAINER. Oh, yes, I said that I did not think that the job would be suitable for me. "Oh," he says, "it is all right." He named a good many people, friends of mine, who held positions there and were getting along all right. About 6 miles above this mill they had a place up there where they dumped the slag from the open-hearth furnaces. I told him that if he would give me that job at the shamley, where they dumped that slag on the Monongahela Valley, that I would accept it. He said, "The job is yours." He took me up to the mill; and when I got up there I said to the captain of the police, "I would like," I says, "Mr. Conroy promised me the job up at the shamley where they are dumping the slag." And he says, "Well, you will have to work in here for 10 or 15 days until you become familiar with the position." Well, at the end of 10 or 15 days I told him—

Senator WALSH. What were you doing during those 10 or 15 days?

Mr. GAINER. Working in the steel mills.

Senator WALSH. Working in the steel mill?

Mr. GAINER. Working in the steel mills.

Senator WALSH. You were not doing any police work?

Mr. GAINER. Yes; I was doing police work.

Senator WALSH. Oh, you were working in the steel mill, doing police work in the steel mill?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And you were going around and finding out what you could of the agitation that was going on?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And were you supposed to keep everything that you learned confidential?

Mr. GAINER. I was supposed to make a report to the foreman of the department in which a man worked, to make a written report to the captain of police.

Senator WALSH. And that report would contain the names of the employees and what they were talking about?

Mr. GAINER. I was not given the names; no.

Senator WALSH. What were you supposed to find out in that position?

Mr. GAINER. Well, I was supposed to find out if they was talking unionism or creating any agitation in any way. It was during the war time, Senator.

Senator WALSH. It was during the war times; and were you to ascertain if there was any un-Americanism?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir; talking—if a man was pro-German; that is what I meant.

Senator WALSH. And is that all you were asked to do, to see if they were talking pro-German?

Mr. GAINER. No. I was asked to watch the men and to see if they were talking unionism at all.

Senator WALSH. And did you find out that any of the men belonged to the union during those days?

Mr. GAINER. Well, I found quite a number of them.

Senator WALSH. Did you report those names?

Mr. GAINER. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Were you supposed to?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. It was one of your duties to do that?

Mr. GAINER. If I was going to be with the steel company and hold that position any length of time, of course I would have had to do it, but rather than to do that, I seen that they were not going to make the change, and I resigned my position.

Senator WALSH. But that was one of your duties, was it not?

Mr. GAINER. That was one of my duties.

Senator WALSH. When was it that you were employed? What month was it?

Mr. GAINER. Why, it was in the latter part of June, last year.

Senator WALSH. In 1918?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir; in 1918.

Senator WALSH. Not this year?

Mr. GAINER. No, sir.

Senator WALSH. Were there any other men doing that work in that plant?

Mr. GAINER. I can not speak for anybody only myself.

Senator WALSH. When you were there and a workman would ask you what work you were doing, what you were employed on, what would you say?

Mr. GAINER. Why, the workmen recognized what I was doing for the simple reason why that I wore a uniform.

Senator WALSH. What kind of a uniform did you wear?

Mr. GAINER. A regular police uniform.

Senator WALSH. A policeman's uniform?

Mr. GAINER. Yes.

Senator WALSH. Did you have any duties as watchman, to see that no fires started, and to see that there was no disorder?

Mr. GAINER. I had duties to watch disorders.

Senator WALSH. And could you do good secret service work if you had a uniform?

Mr. GAINER. Well, I was not supposed to. I do not know about the secret service end of it. I was just supposed to listen and find out what was going on among the men. I do not know whether that I could do secret service work effectively; but I presume at



that particular time the men had a spirit of independence about them, and did not care whether they were discharged or not.

Senator WALSH. Was there a union in the shop at that time?

Mr. GAINER. I do not know whether there was a local union in that vicinity or not connected with the shop. I really do not know. Whether the American Federation at that time, at that particular time, was making any effort to establish an organization in that vicinity, I do not know.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Gainer, your principal business, as you understood it, was to discover whether there was any pro-German sentiment among the men in the mills?

Mr. GAINER. That was one of my instructions.

Senator STERLING. That was one of your instructions, but did you not regard it as your principal duty?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir; I did so.

Senator STERLING. And they also told you to ascertain whether or not there was any agitation for unions?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you assented to the instructions given you at the time?

Mr. GAINER. Why, I did not say either yes or no. It aroused my curiosity. The chief of the detectives had not instructed me to do that, and after I got to the mill and got the uniform, and wore it two or three days, I got instructions from the captain of police to do that.

Senator STERLING. And you did not refuse to follow the instructions when they were given to you?

Mr. GAINER. I did not follow them.

Senator STERLING. And you led him to believe that you would?

Mr. GAINER. I never said whether I would or would not.

Senator STERLING. But you were silent when he gave you those instructions?

Mr. GAINER. Yes, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF MR. GEORGE GAUSNEY.

(George Gausney was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Your name is George Gausney?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. How old are you?

Mr. GAUSNEY. I am 63 years old if I live to next month.

Mr. RUBIN. You are the oldest citizen in Clairton, are you not?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes; I am the oldest citizen in Clairton. I have lived there for 40 years.

Mr. RUBIN. Have you had your home entered by the State constabulary?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir. They came into my house. I come in with my dogs, and I come in to go to lunch between five and six. I had heard someone coming downstairs, and I looked around and I saw a man, and I said "What the hell are you doing in here?" And my wife, she was in the parlor and she was pretty well crippled up, and she heard him come down before that, and she said for me to keep

quiet, and they told me to keep quiet or they would take me up. My wife said, "What do you want to do in here?" They said, "You keep quiet or we will take you up." I thought to myself that there would be someone else taken up. He said, "Where is your cannon?" I said, "I ain't got no cannon." He says, "Where is your guns?" I said, "That is none of your business." He went and opened the cupboard and the cellar, and my wife, she says, "The guns, they are there, seven or eight, in the pantry." He says, "What do you want with so many guns?" I says, "Me and my boys go on hunting trips."

Mr. RUBIN. How long had you been there?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Well, for the last 40 years, since I was married. I have been married 40 years the 12th of January, if I live that long. That is as far as I know. They said I had 24 hours to leave the town. I said, "What the hell do you think I am? A damn bum? I want you to understand that I am a citizen of this town and the oldest man in it." I was born and raised in this township, right near my home. Of course I did not want to get myself in trouble, but if they took the old woman there would have been trouble right there, and damned hard trouble, too, at that.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have lived there for 40 years?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you ever had any trouble before?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Never. Never in my life only when I was a little full and would get in a fight sometimes there among the coal diggers.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you ever worked in the mill?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you belong to the union?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir; I belong to three of them.

The CHAIRMAN. And had you been active at all in the strike?

Mr. GAUSNEY. No, sir; I never was at the meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they examining all of the houses in the town?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir; they examined some. They examined mine, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not know of your own knowledge about them examining the other houses?

Mr. GAUSNEY. I could not say nothing only about what I know myself.

Mr. RUBIN. And did you ask them if they had a search warrant?

Mr. GAUSNEY. I never asked them nothing about me.

Mr. RUBIN. How many sons have you?

Mr. GAUSNEY. I have a stepson, three sons and two daughters, and six little grandchildren that I am working for in order to keep them.

Senator STERLING. How many guns did you have in the house?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Well, I have got six or seven shotguns and rifles, altogether, and they are all paid for and belong to this old chap.

Senator STERLING. Did the officers keep those guns?

Mr. GAUSNEY. No; if they wanted to take the guns they would have to take me.

Senator STERLING. Did they take the guns?

Mr. GAUSNEY. No, sir; they just looked at them.

Senator STERLING. And you explained to them why you had them?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir; I said I had them and the dogs. Every November I go on my trip. I want to tell you something else—while I am on the stand I am going to talk a little while. In this here laboring business a man works for 42 cents an hour, for \$5.88; and with the high price of living, I want to say about that, that we pay 50 cents a pound for meat, and \$3.80 for 49 pounds of flour, and everything else is high, and tell me, how are we going to live on the money?

Senator STERLING. Do your sons work in the mill?

Mr. GAUSNEY. They are all married.

Senator STERLING. Where do they work? Do they work in the mill?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Yes, sir; I work for my son.

Senator STERLING. And how many have you in your home? Just yourself?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Six grandchildren, six grandchildren.

Senator STERLING. And what does your son do?

Mr. GAUSNEY. He is a heater in the finishing mill.

Senator STERLING. And these six grandchildren are his children?

Mr. GAUSNEY. No, sir; they are my daughter's, who died—she died with the flu, and she left the little children home with me, and my other son-in-law was killed in the mill.

Senator STERLING. And what does your son, who is a heater, earn?

Mr. GAUSNEY. He gets so much per hundred tons.

Senator STERLING. And do you know how much he makes a day?

Mr. GAUSNEY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Have you some idea, because of your knowledge of the mills, because of your knowledge of that particular kind of work, just how much he gets?

Mr. GAUSNEY. Well, some days \$12 or \$15 a day, and some days more. I shovel coal in the furnace, and if a man is on the furnace I get his turn.

Senator PHIPPS. What station are you near, out there?

Mr. GAUSNEY. What street?

Senator PHIPPS. Street or railway station. You say that you have been living there for 40 years. I want to locate it.

Mr. GAUSNEY. On Boundary—near the drugstore.

Senator PHIPPS. In Clairton?

Mr. GAUSNEY. In Clairton—North Clairton. I built the first house in the town.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. ERO SUPINEN.

(ERO SUPINEN was thereupon called as a witness, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. Your name is Ero Supinen?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. And do you own your own home?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Where?

Mr. SUPINEN. Clairton.

Mr. RUBIN. And did they shoot through your house?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. When.

Mr. SUPINEN. Last Friday night.

Mr. RUBIN. And is this the bullet that you found [indicating a bullet]?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir; it went through the stove and it stopped inside of the stove.

Mr. RUBIN. And how many bullets were fired through the house?

Mr. SUPINEN. Why, two; and one went right on top of my wife's head.

Mr. RUBIN. Who did the shooting?

Mr. SUPINEN. I don't know who they were shooting.

Mr. RUBIN. Did any constable come into your house?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes; a constable came into my house and running like—I don't know what to call them—and he want to know—they wanted to come into the house and search the house. I wanted to know if they had a permit, and they said no, no permit. "This is my property," I said. "Never mind," he says.

He asked me if I was an American citizen. I said yes. After he talked he went on. The third house from my house a man was shot through the leg, a fellow was laying on the porch.

Mr. RUBIN. He was shot on the porch of his own house?

Mr. SUPINEN. No; the third house from my house.

Senator WALSH. Who shot this man? Who do you claim fired the shot?

Mr. RUBIN. He says he don't know.

Mr. SUPINEN. I do not think the strikers done it, because I never seen the strikers have no gun of any kind.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Rubin, don't you think that this is a little far-fetched, to bring a man on the stand, as precious as our time is at present, to testify that somebody shot through his house?

Mr. RUBIN. It seems to me that we have proven in this case that there has been an unlawful entry to his home, and this bullet being shot through his house is evidence of the terrorism.

Senator STERLING. But there is no connection between the shot through his house and the visit of these constables.

Mr. RUBIN. So far we have shown that the shooting has been done in Clairton by the police and the constables. The evidence shows that the shooting has been done by other people than the police.

Senator STERLING. I want to ask just a question or two. Where did you find that bullet?

Mr. SUPINEN. Inside of the stove.

Senator STERLING. Inside of the stove?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That fell inside of the stove?

Mr. SUPINEN. It went through the stove, through the wall and went through the stove and stopped inside of the stove.

Senator STERLING. What kind of a house is that?

Mr. SUPINEN. It is a frame house.

Senator STERLING. And did you see the hole in the house that was made by this bullet?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you found this inside of the stove?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Now, how did it enter the stove?

Mr. SUPINEN. It went through the stove and stopped inside of the stove.

Senator STERLING. It went through the stove?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. It is a cast-iron stove, is it?

Mr. SUPINEN. A cast-iron stove.

Senator STERLING. Is it a cook stove or is it a heater?

Mr. SUPINEN. No; it is a heater.

Senator STERLING. And how thick was the iron of the stove?

Mr. SUPINEN. I could not ever tell you.

Senator STERLING. Would not you have supposed that it would have battered that bullet if it went through the house and the stove? The bullet is smooth.

Mr. SUPINEN. Well, you can go over there and examine the house to-day and the stove too.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you hear the shot?

Mr. SUPINEN. I was down the street, and I was scared. I was down there, and I was sitting down on a porch with a fellow, and I say, "I go home; I do not like to stay here."

Senator STERLING. Did these policemen come in the house before or after the shots?

Mr. SUPINEN. They came right after the shots.

Senator STERLING. How long after?

Mr. SUPINEN. Just about three or four minutes.

Senator STERLING. Did they make any inquiry about the shots?

Mr. SUPINEN. They asked me where is that fellow that run in.

Senator STERLING. They asked you, "Where is that fellow that ran in?"

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes; and they sat down on the inside of the kitchen, and the Mrs. was on the porch.

Senator PHIPPS. What day was that?

Mr. SUPINEN. Last Friday.

Senator PHIPPS. That was the day before yesterday?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What time in the day?

Mr. SUPINEN. Between 9 and 10 o'clock in the evening.

Senator PHIPPS. Between 9 and 10 o'clock in the evening?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And you heard two shots fired?

Mr. SUPINEN. I heard lots of them.

Senator PHIPPS. You heard lots of shots?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. When did you find this bullet in the stove?

Mr. SUPINEN. The next day the Mrs. find it.

Senator WALSH. Are you out on strike?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Do you belong to the union?

Mr. SUPINEN. No, sir; but I worked four months in the night turn, and I had to work 14 hours, and that is too long, and I can not stay with my family at all, and that is the reason I quit for eight hours. It was terrible to work right upon the open-hearth furnaces. I put the patches on the roof, and it burns and everything else.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you visiting on the piazza of your friend when he was shot?

Mr. SUPINEN. He is not my friend. I do not know him.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you down at his house?

Mr. SUPINEN. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And there was somebody hit three houses from yours?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. That same night?

Mr. SUPINEN. That same night.

Senator PHIPPS. Where were you when this bullet was fired at your house?

Mr. SUPINEN. I was on Phil Dunn's porch. He is a bricklayer.

Senator PHIPPS. How far is that from your house?

Mr. SUPINEN. About three or four blocks.

Senator PHIPPS. And how far from your house was it where the man was hit in the leg?

Mr. SUPINEN. It was three houses from my house.

Senator PHIPPS. When you heard these shots and went down to the house, you did not find the bullet——

Mr. SUPINEN. The Mrs. told me that she heard the noise on the roof, and I told her the next day she could go around and look, and she went into the bathroom and seen a big hole where I have plastered my bathroom with cement, and pretty hard cement, and it went through the stove.

Senator STEPLING. Was the mistress in the house at the time that the shot was fired?

Mr. SUPINEN. The lady upstairs in the house lived up there, and she visits us, and my wife and she were on the porch.

Senator STERLING. The porch in front of your house?

Mr. SUPINEN. In front of my house, and the bullet went through the——

Senator STERLING. Nobody was in the house except the people upstairs?

Mr. SUPINEN. My two boys and one girl.

Senator STERLING. Where were they?

Mr. SUPINEN. He was inside, both of them.

Senator STERLING. And were they in the room where the stove was?

Mr. SUPINEN. It went on the second floor, and the bathroom——

Senator WALSH. Is there anybody else here who was there that night? Are any of your boys here?

Mr. SUPINEN. No.

Senator WALSH. Is there anybody else here who has seen the hole in the house, in the wall?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. You are the only one here who saw it?

Mr. SUPINEN. Yes, sir.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. GEORGE F. COLSON.

(George F. Colson was thereupon recalled as a witness, and having been previously duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. RUBIN. What kind of a bullet is that, Mr. Colson? You have been in the Army.

Mr. COLSON. It is a .45 Colt automatic, Army style.

Mr. RUBIN. Is anybody permitted to have those except those in the Army?

Mr. COLSON. Well, according to the Government you can not buy them off of the Government. The gun must have been stole from the Army. One can not buy them in the Army.

### TESTIMONY OF MRS. MARY KROPICK.

(Mary Kropick was thereupon called as a witness, and having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

(The testimony was taken through an interpreter.)

Mr. RUBIN. Do you live in Denona?

Mrs. KROPICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. With your husband?

Mrs. KROPICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Did anybody ever come into your house and search your house?

Mrs. KROPICK. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you arrested or was your husband arrested?

Mrs. KROPICK. Yes; they took me and my husband and three children to the jail.

Mr. RUBIN. How did that happen, and how did they get in?

The INTERPRETER. That happened on the 8th of October, at 7 o'clock in the morning. She said that she just got up out of bed and went outside to look around, and they were chasing a man and were scattering them off of the street, and she didn't have much time and dressed, and she was out only two or three minutes and went back into the house. She says that they saw her standing out there and she was there for a couple of minutes and some one made her go into the house. She says she stood there a little while by the door and told the States trooper that he can not boss her while she was on her own property. That is the only thing she explained to him, that was her property and would not get off it.

The CHAIRMAN. How could she get that word to him? Could he understand her language?

The INTERPRETER. She said, she claims that this State trooper was Slavish and she told him in Slavish.

Mr. RUBIN. And what happened? Were you taken to jail?

The INTERPRETER. She went in the house and they came right in after her. She went into the house and closed the door and went over and got one of the children and took her on the arm, and they came in and about broke the door down and had the child on her hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the door fastened?

The INTERPRETER. No, sir; they were just partly opened up.

The CHAIRMAN. What did she mean, breaking it down?

The INTERPRETER. She says kicking it and knocked out the bottom panels. He did not ask permission to come in the house; he had not any permission in there at all; he just kicked the bottom panels. That is the way she says.

The CHAIRMAN. Could he not have opened the door? Was it locked?

The INTERPRETER. She says he could come in in a nice way if he wanted to.

Mr. RUBIN. Was her husband fined, and was she fined?

The INTERPRETER. She claims that the fine, that they asked her \$10 for her and \$15 from her husband. She claims that they were half dressed when they were taken to jail, that the children were in their bare feet, and that the children got a bad cold from going down to the police station that morning.

Mr. RUBIN. Did she pay her fine, or did her husband pay her fine?

The INTERPRETER. She did not pay no fine, but she turned around and told the squire there that he come in there the same way like a bum or robber, and he let her go for that.

Senator STERLING. That is, without a fine?

The INTERPRETER. No; she claims she did not get a cent.

Senator STERLING. Did not give a cent?

The INTERPRETER. Did not give a cent, because she was in jail sitting with her three children.

Senator WALSH. He discharged her?

The INTERPRETER. She was in jail. He took her to jail first and from jail they took them down to the squire's office.

Senator WALSH. And when she was before the squire, he discharged her on that statement?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long was she in jail?

The INTERPRETER. She says she was in jail from 7 o'clock up until 1.

Mr. RUBIN. With her children?

The INTERPRETER. With her children, yes; and he turned around; she claims she asked for something to eat for the children, and she would pay for it, and one of the policemen told her that she could die in there from starvation.

The CHAIRMAN. Was her husband fined?

The INTERPRETER. No; he did not pay a cent, either.

Mr. RUBIN. What did she mean when she said that they asked her \$10 from her and \$15 from her husband?

The INTERPRETER. That she can not explain, she says.

Senator PHIPPS. You can find out from her if they asked her for that before they went to jail?

The INTERPRETER. No; that was at the squire's office, Senator. She claims that there was no warrant served for her and for her husband, and that she was punched several times, and her husband was punched by this said State trooper, and they broke in there as highway robbers, and they told the squire that, and he let them off for that.

Mr. RUBIN. Did she say it was the squire asked for \$10?

The INTERPRETER. She said that the Squire asked for \$10 and she would not give it on account of a door broke down and come in as highway robbers.

Senator WALSH. What was her husband doing that morning?

The INTERPRETER. He came over to her and told her that one of the babies was crying.

Senator WALSH. Came over to her?

The INTERPRETER. Over to her by the door, and she took the other baby, she had one on the other arm then.

Senator WALSH. Had the husband been outdoors that morning?

The INTERPRETER. No, sir; her husband was not out. Her husband



told her to dress the children up and they did not give her time to dress the children or herself at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is her husband out on the strike?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is her husband a citizen of the United States?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. Did the child have anything to eat before 1 o'clock that day?

The INTERPRETER. No, sir; not a thing, and she wanted to pay for the food herself for the child, and they told her that they could die in there of starvation.

Senator STERLING. Were there many people on the street that morning when she was arrested?

The INTERPRETER. Yes, sir; there was quite a few.

Senator STERLING. Did she hear any shots fired out in the town that morning shortly before her arrest?

The INTERPRETER. No; she did not hear no shooting around there at all.

Mr. RUBIN. Did her husband bleed?

The INTERPRETER. Her husband's nose was bleeding where the State trooper hit him with a pistol across the face. This other head one grabbed the man and hit them before they had time to defend themselves. That I can not account for myself.

Mr. RUBIN. Senators, in view of the limitation of time, I would like to ask permission to file—we have some affidavits that I would like to file with the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they long affidavits?

Mr. RUBIN. No; they are short affidavits.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. RUBIN. I would like permission to contradict the testimony given by Judge Gary. Judge Gary offered in evidence a certified copy of the coronor's verdict in the Fanny Snellen case. We desire to file for the record—we want to show from her clothes that she was shot behind; the bullet that killed her was shot from behind. We want to offer the clothes in evidence to contradict the findings of the coroner's jury.

Senator PHIPPS. We could not enter into that.

Mr. RUBIN. We have got some of the witnesses here, but I do not want to take your time.

Senator PHIPPS. This case had no connection with this present strike in the steel industry. That is pretty fairly demonstrated, and we have had a certified copy of the coroner's jury findings; that was the one that I submitted in evidence, and not by Judge Gary. Since that time there has been an action on the part of the grand jury, I believe.

Mr. RUBIN. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Supporting the findings of the coroner's jury.

Mr. RUBIN. We are trying—

The CHAIRMAN. This whole thing, I think, should be eliminated from this steel-strike investigation.

Mr. RUBIN. I am merely offering it for the purpose of showing the general attitude of the authorities toward the strikers before and during the progress of this strike, and we have here the physical

evidence that this woman was shot from behind—the clothes with the blood on it—and the jury makes a finding—

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the clothes here?

Mr. RUBIN. No.

Senator PHIPPS. So far as that is concerned, the evidence introduced before the coroner's jury was to the effect that Fanny Snellen was in the crowd when the riot was underway, and that the officers had been assaulted, and that the officer fired in his own defense—

Senator McKELLAR. I suggest that you file an affidavit and let it go at that.

Mr. RUBIN. All right.

Now, in regard to Mr. Brennen, I think that you gentlemen ought to give him 5 or 10 minutes to make a statement.

Senator PHIPPS. Your own testimony was not taken. Of course, you have not appeared as a witness at any time. As an attorney, your statements have been recorded in these hearings. You will remember that at one of the hearings in Washington I requested a certain witness to state why labor unions did not incorporate and if there were any reasons why they should not incorporate, and I believe you made a remark at that time that Mr. Gompers interposed and volunteered to make a statement himself during the time that was allotted him to present testimony at the second time that he appeared before this committee. The hour was late and other things were dwelt upon, and Mr. Gompers never stated the attitude of organized labor in the matter of incorporating the unions. Are you prepared to give this committee those reasons?

Mr. RUBIN. Well, the sole reason that labor organizations do not care to be incorporated is because Mr. Gompers, as the head of the American Federation of Labor, believes in a voluntary organization, and does not believe in any other than the entity which the men themselves create. In other countries organizations do incorporate, and there are some unions that do incorporate, but they have merely followed the policy laid down by Mr. Gompers. There are no legal reasons for it, because in most States you can serve upon a voluntary organization by serving the members—that is, upon the president and the secretary.

Senator PHIPPS. And that was done up in the Danbury hatters' case?

Mr. RUBIN. Yes. In some States you have to serve upon the individual. In common law they are a copartnership, and it is a little more difficult to reach them, but in most States they have laws—for instance, in Michigan, and I believe in Massachusetts, you can serve an unincorporated body by serving upon the president.

Senator PHIPPS. You were present and heard the testimony of the president of the Wheeling Steel & Iron Co.—I believe that is the name of the company—who testified before this committee that the men working in the departments of his mill were unionized under an agreement and entered into an agreement with the Amalgamated Iron and Steel Association June 30 of 1919, and which contract would run until July 1 of 1920. They left their work and broke their contract—

Mr. RUBIN. I did not hear that testimony.

Senator PHIPPS. You may have been out of the room. In a case of that kind, what assurance has the company, when it enters into a

contract, that the contracts are going to be kept? And in case contracts are not kept, what redress has the company other than to sue the individual workers who have failed to keep their agreement and thereby caused loss to the company that entered into the contract with them?

Mr. RUBIN. It seems to me, Senator, as an abstract proposition, that the company is better off in suing the individual members than suing the corporation, because there would be a corporation limitation, because the assets of the corporation are in the corporation, where there is not a personal liability as there is in a partnership liability.

The CHAIRMAN. You recognize the almost herculean efforts one would have to make in order to reach the individual?

Mr. RUBIN. I know, but as a corporation——

Senator PHIPPS. To bring them into court.

Mr. RUBIN. But as a corporation the assets of the corporation would be very little. That would be the limit of the liability, and it seems to me from the standpoint of liability a partnership carries with it a greater responsibility than a corporation.

### TESTIMONY OF CAPT. WILLIAM B. HUNTER.

(William B. Hunter was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Hunter, I do not know what your testimony is to be; I have not talked with you. You may go ahead just in your own way and give your testimony.

Mr. HUNTER. It is in regard to the testimony given by Mr. Feeney——

Mr. RUBIN (interrupting). Where do you live?

Capt. HUNTER. I live at Monessen.

Mr. RUBIN. And what is your business?

Capt. HUNTER. I am a physician.

Mr. RUBIN. Go ahead.

Capt. HUNTER. Also president of the council.

Mr. RUBIN. President of the council—town council?

Capt. HUNTER. I want to give testimony in regard to Mr. Feeney. He gave testimony yesterday that he had organized a committee out there of robbers and gamblers, etc., and as one of that committee I have come down to refute that statement. That committee is made up of American citizens, and I suppose that one-third of them have served in the foreign service, and it is also made up of the best business men of the town.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you served in the foreign service?

Capt. HUNTER. I have served in the foreign service, practically 23 months of the service.

The CHAIRMAN. And who are the others?

Capt. HUNTER. Well, they are men——

The CHAIRMAN. Of this committee.

Capt. HUNTER. Mr. Shuck is editor of the News.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his business—what are the businesses of the others?

Capt. HUNTER. Well, Mr. Thomas is cashier of the First National Bank and Mr. Odbert is a retired man. J. B. White is justice of the peace.

Senator PHIPPS. Please speak louder. We can not hear you at this end of the table.

Capt. HUNTER. We organized that committee for the purpose of protecting the town, and we took no part in the strike either way, because we were simply the business men. The business men did that because they made threats to destroy property, and they also in their parades took men and forced them into the parade, and we felt that they were getting reckless, and we simply formed that committee to take care of the interests of the town and not to take any part on behalf of the mill or the strikers. We were entirely disinterested, and formed the committee simply to preserve order in the town.

Senator WALSH. When did you form your committee, Captain?

Capt. HUNTER. On the 21st of September.

Senator WALSH. The day of the strike, or about the time of the strike?

Capt. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further, Captain?

Capt. HUNTER. No more than this, that we will present a list of the men and their businesses to you.

Senator STERLING. You were doing that. Go ahead with the list.

Capt. HUNTER. Mr. Shuck has the list and the addresses. We have about 900 men sworn in in the town.

Senator STERLING. About how many?

Capt. HUNTER. About 900.

Senator STERLING. Have you had any disorder out there?

Capt. HUNTER. There were some. We had some windows broken.

Senator MCKELLAR. Was anyone seriously hurt?

Capt. HUNTER. No; only threats.

Senator MCKELLAR. What has been the attitude of the strikers? Have they been law-abiding or not?

Capt. HUNTER. They started to be lawless, and for that reason we did this.

Senator MCKELLAR. And have they been lawless since that time?

Capt. HUNTER. Not since, because we would simply preserve order. We have at the present time over 100 police on the pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a very large foreign population?

Capt. HUNTER. About 80 per cent foreign of the whole town, with 23,000 population.

Senator MCKELLAR. How many men are out on strike?

Capt. HUNTER. Pretty close to 10,000.

Senator STERLING. Has this committee something to do with directing arrests to be made?

Capt. HUNTER. Nothing at all, save to offer their services to help the burgess to enforce order.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any negro deputies?

Capt. HUNTER. There were negro deputies sworn in.

Senator STERLING. How did they happen to be sworn in?

Capt. HUNTER. Well, in this way: The night that we had the meeting in the high-school building they requested the men who were willing to back him up to be sworn in as deputies.

Senator STERLING. Were those negroes given guns?

Capt. HUNTER. No, sir; there are no persons given guns by the borough except State officers. These other men are only kept in case of emergency.

Senator McKELLAR. They have no guns?

Capt. HUNTER. No, sir.

Mr. FEENEY. I will say that on the morning that the parade come from Donora that every one of them workmen were armed with shotguns, rifles, and pistols. There was not one that was not armed.

Capt. HUNTER. Yes, sir; there were 57 men armed.

Mr. RUBIN. How many of them were armed?

Capt. HUNTER. Fifty-seven.

Mr. RUBIN. Armed?

Capt. HUNTER. Fifty-seven; furnished by the State of Pennsylvania with riot guns. I carried one myself.

Senator STERLING. Did any of the colored men carry any?

Capt. HUNTER. I think three or four ex-soldiers were in there, and the ex-soldiers had them.

Senator STERLING. Those colored men were ex-soldiers?

Capt. HUNTER. Those colored men were ex-soldiers.

Senator STERLING. And you say they were armed with riot guns?

Capt. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What is a riot gun?

Capt. HUNTER. It is a Winchester shotgun with a 20-inch barrel, loaded with buckshot.

Senator STERLING. Were any of the colored men armed with revolvers?

Capt. HUNTER. No, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. Were you at the meeting the night before the parade, where it was discussed, the arrest of and getting Mr. Feeney?

Capt. HUNTER. There was never any discussion as to that. I attended every meeting. When the burgess is not in the town I act in his stead, and I have done so twice since this trouble started.

Senator WALSH. How many of the people are English-speaking and how many foreigners of the 23,000?

Capt. HUNTER. I do not think we have got more than 2,000 American-speaking people.

Senator WALSH. And what are the others—what do you call foreigners?

Capt. HUNTER. That would be the American-born people.

The CHAIRMAN. And what are you doing to Americanize them?

Capt. HUNTER. We have run a night school, but we do not get much attendance.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you ever try a compulsory education on them? If you had that—

Capt. HUNTER. We have it in regard to the children, but not for the adults.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the children of the foreigners attend the school?

Capt. HUNTER. Yes, sir; about 2,500. There are more Italians attending than Americans.

Senator McKELLAR. And they are taught only English in this school, are they?

Capt. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. What foreign nationality predominates?

Capt. HUNTER. Italian in the schools, and Slavish next.

Senator STERLING. But take the population itself in that city, which has the majority of the nationality?

Capt. HUNTER. It is pretty hard for me to answer that correctly.

Senator STERLING. Do you think the Slavish people?

Capt. HUNTER. There is an awful lot of Greeks——

Senator STERLING. Do you think that you have an unusually large number of Italians there?

Capt. HUNTER. We have a good many. We have more in the school.

Senator WALSH. Do these other nationalities have schools of their own? Is that the reason?

Capt. HUNTER. The Slavish have schools of their own, to a certain extent, but the Italians do not.

Senator WALSH. The Italians have none?

Capt. HUNTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the Slavish schools conducted in English?

Capt. HUNTER. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other nationalities that have schools there?

Capt. HUNTER. I believe that the Polish have.

The CHAIRMAN. And are their schools conducted in English?

Capt. HUNTER. Well, they are taught by the nuns, and I could not tell you.

Senator STERLING. Would there be school facilities where they could be taught English in your town?

Capt. HUNTER. Every child in the town we provide schools for.

Senator STERLING. And they would not have to have these Slavish schools?

Capt. HUNTER. No; we have in our town eight large school buildings.

Senator WALSH. But English is taught in all the schools—the private schools as well as the public schools?

Capt. HUNTER. They do not in their foreign schools.

Senator WALSH. Haven't you a law in this State requiring that English shall be taught in the schools?

Capt. HUNTER. It is supposed to be, but those schools we have no jurisdiction over.

Senator WALSH. Haven't you jurisdiction over them if there is a law requiring English to be taught to all children?

Capt. HUNTER. I do not think anyone has went into the trouble. They are taught in the basements of the churches, and we never interfere.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. C. L. SCHUCK.

(C. L. Schuck was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Schuck, we will be glad to hear from you.

Mr. SCHUCK. I wish to say in the beginning that this committee is not here at its own instigation and that we regret to have to take up

your time, but after reading the papers last night in regard to Mr. Feeney's testimony, who said that he was an organizer for Charleroi, and who characterized the committee in the way that he did, the committee that I represent, I suppose that there were a dozen phone calls—telephone calls—asking that this should be in some way corrected in the public mind.

The reason that I was called was from the fact that at the last board of trade meeting a committee of three was appointed to draft a resolution protesting against Mr. Fitzpatrick's testimony in Washington about the bad living conditions. We sent a telegram in regard to that protest to Senator Kenyon; and we know that the foreign element lived just as well as they wanted to and as we could teach them to, and that they had the money to live better if they desired so to do. So last night when the paper came out with this characterization of the committee, and characterizing our town as a bloodthirsty town, where we had sworn in deputies that were chiefly ex-gamblers, etc., I started out at 9 o'clock last night to get Senator Kenyon on the 'phone, and I did not reach him until 10 o'clock this morning, by telegram.

I want to say to you, if I am allowed to go on for a few minutes, I have here as exhibits which I wish to leave with the committee, three newspapers, one giving the burgess' proclamation, the next giving the citizens' meeting at the time when the Citizens' Protective League was formed and the resolution adopted; and there the burgess asked that they stand up in rows of 12 citizens, those who would volunteer to act as special officers in case that they were needed. Not a one failed to stand up.

I will tell you why the meeting was necessary. After we swore in all of that body—I will have for the record a full list of the names, which I got at the police station before we left—about 900 citizens who will act as officers in case they are needed; but, in fact, they have got the town in such a way that their services are not needed.

I said I would refer to a point in this testimony of the general character of these citizens. They are such as you would pick up in calling a public meeting. I will come to the point that I was after. I want you to know why it was called. We, as citizens, and you who have visited industrial towns have had the same experience, and many believed that we could go through these parades, and that they were harmless. Well, they passed my office. They passed my office quietly one day. I believed in the same way. I will say that I thought that the meetings could be held and that there would be no harm come from them.

I, as burgess, was disposed to be lenient. They had their parades and they continued to grow, and they would traverse the town from one end of the town to the other. The question was if we thought we could let meetings and parades go on harmlessly. I was in a little meeting of a dozen citizens which said, "What shall we do? I went out from that meeting and I stood in front of my office, and it was about the second or third parade, and unconsciously those men when they are turned loose they don't know what they will do. The men will instruct them and tell them to do this and that. I went out from this meeting. I was sort of

convinced that the parades and the meetings were harmless, because the town had been absolutely quiet. It had been quieter than it was in the mill days, because there were no whistles and no noises. I was hollered at in a joking way, and I was told to take my hat off to that parade. I did not get angry at that, but I could see that this contingent could unconsciously be aroused by over-enthusiastic men and I know that every day this went on there was further infractions or indiscretions made by them. Men would run and grab them, grab other men from the curb.

So the leading citizens in town consulted with the burgess, and asked him to do it, and he decided to promulgate a proclamation in the afternoon of Tuesday, and ask that there be no further parades or public meetings. I have the paper with a full account of the meeting. In this proclamation he asked the people to back him up in all he has asked in the enforcement of law and order.

I did not finish this little point, that I became convinced that these meetings could not go on, regardless of the fact that there may be something said about freedom. The next morning we had a counter-parade from Denora, and our burgess had made a proclamation that our people should not parade. This public meeting had a great moral effect, because these men went out, 900 of them, with special officers' badges on them, law and order. They were simply to preserve law and order while this unrest was on. This parade started from Denora, and it was the source of considerable excitement and contention, and by that time we had the assistance of a squad of State police, who headed the citizens' body, and we went to the lower end of the town; and several of the citizens went down and asked the Denora parade to stop, and that we would have no disorder, and there was in the act of tearing down the burgess' proclamation off a telephone pole, and one of the special officers protested to him about it—a colored man—and the colored man said that he was reaching in his pocket for his gun, and the colored man drew his gun and shot him in his shoulder and he was taken to the police station; and they were placed under bond; he was placed under bond, and so was the colored man, the special officer; and then it developed that the man who did tear down the proclamation did have a 48-caliber revolver in his pocket. They were both placed under arrest. It was felt that that was the thing to do; and then it was shown that this official was vindicated, that he was within his rights when he did what he did.

Senator STERLING. Were they both placed under bonds for their appearance in court?

Mr. SCHUCK. So far as I know, they are. They were placed under bonds, \$500 and \$200, that day. That is the most that I know about that.

I want to say this about these 950: That when we were coming down we took this police record of the 900 special officers and we picked out 150 names, representatives of the committee, and we scanned them over in order that you might know the various occupations that they are in. Among them is four ministers and four public-school teachers, our superintendent of schools, bankers, president of one bank and cashiers of two, and those are our citizens who joined together to preserve law and order, and they took no part in the controversy between the employer and the employees.



Senator McKELLAR. How many colored men were there in them?

Mr. SCHUCK. Well, just as it would be in a town of that kind and in the meeting of that kind.

Senator McKELLAR. About how many are there?

Mr. SCHUCK. I do not suppose in that there would be more than 20 or 30 colored men.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there any feeling of resentment on the part of the white people that colored officers should be designated in this way?

Mr. SCHUCK. There is some criticism, but I will tell you a little experience I had in that connection. There was a petition came—a petition was circulated to discharge all of the colored men from the force. There are certain classes of foreign people that detest the colored man, and that petition was sent in to the burgess, and he was inclined to listen to it and discharge all of them; but it developed that the petition was fostered and drawn in another town and brought to our town and signed largely by people who were not of our town. The head of our Citizens' Protective League stated to me—I was inclined to think that it should be done—and William Houston, an ex-captain in the service in France, who is in charge of the protective league, he said—I asked him, "Is this a good idea?" He said: "Well, if some of those petitioners, the people who object to these colored people, will go out and take their places, then it will be all right, because they were right there on the morning that the Denora parade started, and I did not see any of them"—

Senator STERLING. Do you say that the colored men were all ex-soldiers?

Mr. SCHUCK. Well, I could not say so. They attempted to pick them, because William Houston is an ex-captain of the Rainbow Division, and he handled it immensely well. The only arrests made were two men—two women who attempted to throw pepper in the eyes of two policemen.

Senator STERLING. At that parade, they turned back when they saw that the soldiers were armed?

Mr. SCHUCK. The State policemen rode out and said—

Mr. RUBIN. May I ask if he got a permit for the holding of that meeting?

Mr. SCHUCK. The burgess called the citizens together, and he asked the citizens to back up his proposition, and they met at the high-school building that night and they planned the Citizens' Protective League.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask you about something that came up to-day. There is a lady testified that she was on the street and that her husband went into a store to get something, and he came out, and he took her by the arm and started up the street, and an officer came along—I am not certain about him being a colored man; it was not a colored man—and arrested her and took her away from her husband and bruised her, and she put up \$50 before the burgess, and they appeared at 9.30 o'clock the next morning—the case was set between 8.30 and 9.30—and they appeared at 9.20 o'clock the next morning and were told that the case had been disposed of and the \$50 forfeited.

Do you know anything about that?

Mr. SCHUCK. In my work I know of the incident of her arrest; but as to what proceedings were had in the police court I do not know. But our police court has not been conducted that way in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about that case?

Mr. SCHUCK. I do about the arrest. That took place the second night.

The CHAIRMAN. About 6 o'clock?

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Were there any grounds for that arrest?

Mr. SCHUCK. I will tell you about what grounds there were. I heard about the case the next morning. I want just to say that we feel this way toward the foreigners: They are bad; and the women, they do not know what to do——

Senator WALSH. I think that they ought to be treated right.

Mr. SCHUCK. Well, this woman knew that she could not loiter on the street, because the special officers, they were put there to keep the street clear, and it was out on Morgan Avenue that this happened. The man went into the house, and the woman made a demonstration on the street, and on this occasion they attempted to throw pepper in the eyes of the officers, and two of the most boisterous women were arrested. I believe that was one of the women that was taken to the police station.

Senator McKELLAR. That is not in accordance with the testimony here. The testimony here of this young woman—certainly she was a well-appearing young woman, a very quiet sort of appearing young woman—she testified that she had a little girl 3 years old with her—she called it her baby—that the husband was with her, and was passing in front of a store, and the husband went in to buy a package of cigarettes; and when he came out an officer had ridden up and taken her by the arm and had accused her of calling him a son of a bitch; and that he grabbed her roughly and bruised her and took her to jail; and he kept her there until the husband put up \$50, and the \$50 was forfeited. If those were the facts, somebody owes that woman a reparation. If it is true, it is an outrage.

Mr. SCHUCK. I can not answer, only that it is not reasonable, the way the citizens and the officers even try to handle themselves.

Senator McKELLAR. And you would not defend a proposition of that kind?

Mr. SCHUCK. No, sir; certainly not.

Senator McKELLAR. Will you look that up?

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes; I will ask the burgess about that hearing; but, as I understand it, she never got her forfeit back because she was 10 minutes late. I will write Senator Kenyon about that.

Senator McKELLAR. And I would like to have made a part of that inquiry as to whether or not two women were compelled to march down between files——

Mr. SCHUCK. I am satisfied that that was the time when this happened. There was a number of foreign women that went out and were boisterous. Women came to the station with babies in their arms, and the officers asked they why they were not in their homes and they were out in the street and were arrested.

Senator McKELLAR. This young woman made a very great impression upon me.

Mr. SCHUCK. Can you give the name?

Mr. RUBIN. Their name is Andy Banks. The mother of Mrs. Banks was assaulted also.

Mr. SCHUCK. Andy Banks; that is a peculiar name for a woman.

Mr. RUBIN. Mrs. Andy Banks.

Mr. SCHUCK. I will tell you what we did. We heard of all kinds of reports of mistreatment of these people by the special officers. It is our duty as citizens to have every one of these stories traced down, and I believe that we should, because it is the method practiced in neighboring towns of breaking down our defense. This has been to the benefit and advantage of the striker as much as to anybody else. We have had only one man hurt. I doubt when these that you have cited; I believe that when they are investigated, it will be found that there was fault on both sides. We have had law and order, due to the citizens taking hold of the situation, and we are here to defend our town.

Senator WALSH. How many strikers are there out in your town?

Mr. SCHUCK. I will say—I do not think that Dr. Hunter qualified it. He should have qualified that as to the actual strikers. We have six mills, and two of them are of the United States Steel Corporation and four independent, and the actual strikers, I do not think that there are 8,000 people who are out of employment because the mill shut down. Out of that 8,000 who are not working to-day, I don't believe there is over a thousand—that is high, I think—that wanted to strike for the sake of striking; I don't think there are more than 2,000 of them.

Senator WALSH. But out of the entire population of 23,000 people, practically every single person that is working in the industry is out of employment?

Mr. SCHUCK. They were for about two weeks, but last Monday they began to start.

Senator WALSH. Is not that an unusually large percentage of persons employed of that population? I have been under the impression that not more than one-fifth of the population of a community are employed in the industries. You have over one-third.

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And you only will have one child and one woman—

Mr. SCHUCK. Well, I will explain that. We practically are the employment office or source of employment for half a dozen towns around.

Senator WALSH. So that these people live in other towns?

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes, sir. There is where a great deal of our trouble comes from. They have their rooms all around the town.

Senator McKELLAR. I want to ask another question. I will have to get the stenographer to give you the name. It is a storekeeper—

Mr. RUBIN. Andy Plover.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; and he was on the stand this afternoon, and he testified that he was a storekeeper, and as he opened his door one morning, some man was standing outside in the rain, and he said, "Come in out of the rain"; and about that time one of the State constabulary rode up and struck him over the head, and he has got a very bad wound on his head now, and they arrested him,

and they took him to jail and they fined him \$6, and they made him put up \$300 worth of Liberty bonds; and he went to the county seat and undertook to have the one who arrested him indicted, and as soon as the man got notice of that he came with, some assistants and arrested him again and took him back, and they made him put up \$500 in Liberty bonds, making \$800 in all; and have wondered if that story was true.

Mr. SCHUCK. Well, I will get you—

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know the facts?

Mr. SCHUCK. I know the public version. Where is his store?

Senator McKELLAR. I do not know where it is.

Mr. SCHUCK. He should have been asked in this testimony, according to the public idea whether or not he had not told the strikers that were out on the street and the police kept moving on, whether or not he did not tell them to go into a store, that that was his property, and that they could go in there whenever they wanted to.

Senator McKELLAR. How would that affect him? He had a perfect right to invite anybody into the store, a store that belongs to him, without being arrested for it.

Mr. SCHUCK. I would like to finish the question before the answer. I will answer, too.

Senator McKELLAR. I am asking the question, not answering it.

Mr. SCHUCK. This is the version I got from a newspaper man, that he remonstrated, and that he reached over and seized the officer from the curb, and that the officer reached over and struck him. That is the way that I got it. I am not here to argue about this. I am only interested in preserving law and order.

Senator McKELLAR. And that is the very—

Mr. SCHUCK (interrupting). And this man should have been asked that question.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked him the question if his store was an assembling place for the strikers.

Mr. SCHUCK. And he said that he would—

The CHAIRMAN. He said that anybody could come in that wanted to.

Mr. SCHUCK. And he had annoyed the officers by inviting them in?

Senator McKELLAR. And when an officer is on duty, because he is an officer, has he a right to club a man and to arrest him and to rearrest him again?

Mr. SCHUCK. I was told—this is a State police officer?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SCHUCK. What he said. I think that they have a warrant out for him, for assault and battery, for the State police officer.

Senator McKELLAR. You might include that in the proof. That is a very unusual occurrence, and I would like to know what occurred.

Mr. SCHUCK. What I heard about this man is, from what I heard, that this man had defied the officer. I might get the affidavit of the officer, if that would do any good.

Senator McKELLAR. We would like to get disinterested persons.

Senator WALSH. You have a very serious problem, with 8,000 people here out of work, with not an industry running, and only

3,000 English-speaking people in your community. I should think that there was a very great responsibility upon men like yourself.

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And it behooves them to be impartial, in order to bring about peace and to preserve order?

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. And I think that they should try to keep an open mind.

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes; we try. I beg your pardon, but I think that Dr. Hunter—I would like to qualify what he said. I think that the doctor was perfectly right when he said that there were a couple of thousand of English American speaking people—American born people. Three-fourths of our foreigners can talk the English language.

Senator WALSH. But they have their own customs——

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes; they have their own customs; and I think there are 5,000 American born. It is hard to get at that unless you have these by districts.

Senator WALSH. Would it not operate very much to preserve order, the law and order, if the people who could reach these people could go to them and preach law and order? Why don't you allow the organizers to talk law and order to them?

The CHAIRMAN. You have a foreign community that is practically moved into your community—these Italians——

Mr. SCHUCK. I was connected with the board of trade 10 years ago when we took a census of the town, and the greatest number in employment were Slavs and the next were Greeks and the next were Italians. There are more of the Italian children in the schools. We have quite a different nationality in our public schools, including a Jap and a Chinese.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the Japs and the Chinese get along all right?

Mr. SCHUCK. Well, we have great problems, and it is a question for the few Americans that are in this community to guide a community like this, and that is one of the things that has brought us here. We do not care to be criticized when we have done as much work as we have. The superintendent of schools was talking to me yesterday on this disorder and the enforcement of order. We have had no disorder, because we have prevented it. He says he was highly pleased with the number of foreign boys who were attending the schools there and who were graduating, and the kind that were going to be Americans, and that there was not a one that he had heard anything of that had anything to do at all with this strike. Those boys that have gone through the schools are as good Americans as ourselves.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they speak the English language?

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes, sir; they speak the English language and graduate from the high school, and they were out at this meeting, and they wear the State officer badges, and they are as good citizens as any of them.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of them have been graduated from those schools?

Mr. SCHUCK. I suppose that we have graduated several hundred of those foreign boys; and those foreign boys, when you get them Americanized, they are as good citizens as anybody, and really our town is proud of the schools; but this is the floating population that is

causing us concern. Among the list that we have brought here, which we will leave with you, out of the 900, I dare say, that there are three or four hundred that are really mill workers and foreign men.

Mr. RUBIN. May I ask this one question? What trouble have you had with the foreigners other than joining the union?

Mr. SCHUCK. Well, I do not see what he would refer to. We have never had any trouble since 1900 of any kind.

Mr. RUBIN. Not any trouble at all?

Mr. SCHUCK. Not any trouble at all.

Mr. RUBIN. And the only trouble that you apprehended was the forming of the union and a strike—

Mr. SCHUCK. No; it was the parades and the marching there which brewed riot.

Senator STERLING. Let me ask, at this public meeting were the merits of the controversy discussed at all?

Mr. SCHUCK. Yes; the necessity of preserving law and order, and the people keeping cool and upholding the officers of the law. They were careful there, as I am careful here, not to raise this issue.

Senator STERLING. Was the question of unionism presented there at all?

Mr. SCHUCK. It was never mentioned.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. J. D. WHITE.

(J. D. White was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. You are a justice of the peace?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may sit, if you desire.

Mr. WHITE. I thought that you wanted me to stand up.

The CHAIRMAN. Our time is limited, and I wish that you would go into this and tell it in your own way.

Mr. WHITE. I was invited this afternoon to appear before this committee and review the accusations or the claims that abuses have been carried on in Monessen. I do not care to say very much, except to certify, as an observer, that I think the law has been enforced efficiently, lawfully, and commendably.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did the case of the little lady who was arrested in front of the store come before you?

Mr. WHITE. No.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did you happen to know anything about it of your own knowledge?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Schuck gave the version as it is given commonly in the town, and the way that I heard it, that they were obstructionists and unlawful.

Senator MCKELLAR. If they had been notified to come to court at 8.30 to 9.30, and when they got there at 9.20, you would not have permitted a forfeit in your court, would you?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know what the custom of the burgess is. That was a burgess hearing.

Senator MCKELLAR. And is that the way that you notify them—to come before your court from 8 to 9, or from 9 to 10?

Mr. WHITE. Well, we have that way in the civil examination, but not in the criminal. It is a State minute.

Senator McKELLAR. The reason that I ask that is that they are granted an hour's grace in my State, and this couple both testified that that was the grace given them; that they should be there between 8.30 and 9.30, and at 9.20 they were told that their forfeit had been forfeited to the county.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know anything about the case?

Mr. WHITE. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did any of these cases come before you as a justice of the peace?

Mr. WHITE. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Where they have disorderly conduct charges, do they come before you?

Mr. WHITE. I have had some disorderly conduct, but not very much.

Senator STERLING. Where the strikers have been arrested?

Mr. WHITE. I have had some,

Senator STERLING. How many?

Mr. WHITE. Well, I have had 19 arrests for unlawful assembly and 3 for inciting riots; I think 22 in all.

Senator STERLING. Twenty-two altogether?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How did you dispose of those cases?

Mr. WHITE. In the 19 cases—that is, of the unlawful assembly—I discharged 2 and placed 17 under \$200 bail for the court.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess that is about all the information that you can give us.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. A. E. THOMAS.

(A. E. Thomas was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. THOMAS. Banker.

The CHAIRMAN. What have you to say about the situation there?

Mr. THOMAS. The only thing that I can say is that I object and resent the statement of Mr. Feeney made before you as to the organization of the citizens of Monessen, as to their being the riffraff and gamblers and cutthroats, or anything else that he might have to call them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all?

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will take you as an exhibit on that?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. H. N. ODBERT.

(H. N. Odbert was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Odbert, what is your business?

Mr. ODBERT. Real estate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is your testimony about the same as these other gentlemen?

Mr. ODBERT. Just about the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you add anything to it?

Mr. ODBERT. I do not think so.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you seen any disorder in Monessen since the strike, since the 22d day of September?

Mr. ODBERT. No, sir; none whatever.

Senator PHIPPS. Prior to that time—that is, when the public meetings were being held, involving marching in the street, parades—were you fearful that they would lead to trouble among your people?

Mr. ODBERT. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you see any incidents where men, spectators along the sidewalks, for instance, were interfered with by the marchers?

Mr. ODBERT. Well, I saw two men and they were motioned to to come out in the parade, but they were not interefered with. I can not say that there was any disorder. I heard some people called "scabs" and they were hollered at, but that was the only thing.

Senator PHIPPS. And was that generally done?

Mr. ODBERT. No; not generally; it was not done frequently.

Senator STERLING. Were you present at the public meeting when the men were sworn in that night?

Mr. ODBERT. No. I was at the board of trade meeting, where a resolution was passed resenting the statements of the riffraff and cutthroats, and that committee was formed for the purpose of resenting that statement.

Senator STERLING. That was the purpose of the committee?

Mr. ODBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBIN. I think that in fairness to the citizens of Monessen that Mr. Feeney did not refer to anybody but the colored men.

Mr. ODBERT. As I recall it, he did not state it in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Schuck, I want to say to you, in regard to this telegram that you sent to me that I have received so many telegrams that I do not know whether I received your telegram or not, but we filed it with the papers. It is impossible for us to answer all the mail and telegrams that I received about the strike.

Mr. SCHUCK. I should be pleased to have that list and the articles referred to go into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be printed in the record.

(The proclamations, lists, resolutions, and articles in the newspapers referred to are here inserted in the record in full, as follows:)

MONESSEN SPECIAL OFFICERS.

Name.	Occupation.	Name.	Occupation.
D. R. Rodgers .....	Grocer.	C. I. Duvall .....	Real estate.
F. D. Fleming .....	Barber.	Jos. Brown .....	Mill man.
Geo. S. Phillips .....	Garage.	C. H. Dir's .....	Real estate.
Dale Warman .....	Grocer.	Jay Garman .....	Insurance.
Chas. A. Geiss .....	Hotel.	U. F. Blackburn .....	Principal of schools.
H. H. Snyder .....	Bank clerk.	Lorin Culler .....	Secretary board of trade.
J. H. Racy .....	Dry Goods.	E. B. Slotterbeck .....	Physician.
C. L. Jones .....	Freight agent.	J. B. White .....	Justice of peace.
W. H. Reese .....	Contractor.	A. E. Thomas .....	Banker.
R. B. Scott .....	Bank clerk.	W. Morse Ney .....	Dry Goods.
J. J. Goulding .....	Hotel.	G. A. Homann .....	Shoes.
Chas. Friedhoff .....	Insurance.	J. E. Newcomer .....	Real estate.
E. L. Hibbs .....	Real estate.	Alex. Daunut .....	Dry goods.
W. O. Berry .....	Grocer.	G. H. Thomas .....	Publisher.
Jules Albert .....	Dr.	Jas. W. Gorman .....	Dry Goods.
August Peters .....	Butcher.	W. P. Kirk .....	Druggist.
L. Jamison .....	Western Union operator.	Mike Joseph .....	Dry goods.
R. ger Richards .....	Florist.	J. P. Craig .....	Sign painter.
S. S. Jones .....	Automobiles.	Geo. R. Warman .....	Grocer.
C. L. Lewis .....	Tailor.	W. J. Merritt .....	Laundryman.
D. R. Graham .....	Minister.	Mike Skirpan .....	Real estate.



## MONESSEN SPECIAL OFFICERS—continued.

Name.	Occupation.	Name.	Occupation.
A. R. Ney .....	Dry goods.	H. E. Gress .....	Superintendent of schools.
Geo. Nash .....	Bank president.	O. F. Pannabaker .....	Assistant auditor.
R. S. Kelly .....	Underiaker.	J. C. Lermann .....	Clerk.
Mike Malinak .....	Real estate.	Chas. Sprouse .....	Grocery clerk
F. J. Lane .....	Reporter.	James E. McShane .....	Mail carrier.
Guy R. Eddy .....	Druggist.	S. W. Lauze .....	Roller.
John Reed .....	Real estate.	J. B. Swain .....	Minister.
M. A. Daugherty .....	Mill worker.	Jos. Leone .....	Barber.
Morris Rozner .....	Butcher.	Wm. Hough .....	Blacksmith.
C. L. Schuck .....	Publisher.	Frank Garrett .....	Roller.
Joe Parnelli .....	Commission man.	Wm. Jones .....	Automobiles.
J. H. Kelly .....	Bank president.	A. N. Chalfant .....	Boss roller.
M. E. Bersey .....	Insurance.	Frank Vennert .....	Automobiles.
J. V. Conti .....	Commission man.	J. D. Chamberlain .....	Head shipper.
F. Alexander .....	Blacksmith.	F. A. Lohman .....	Architect.
O. F. Piper .....	Shoes.	D. R. Woodfill .....	Printer.
Jesse Hancock .....	Banker.	S. S. Townsend .....	Instructor.
L. P. Carter .....	Coal operator.	C. S. Regan .....	Glass worker.
W. D. Hunter .....	Physician.	E. V. Anderson .....	Department superintendent.
Edw. J. Fohl .....	Mill worker.	R. G. Todd .....	Insurance.
Arthur M. Hart .....	Mill foreman.	F. J. Meybin .....	Clerk.
E. H. Robinson .....	Box manufacturer.	H. E. Rinehart .....	Auto accessories.
Lurty Martz .....	Postal clerk.	H. F. Yeaton .....	Mill clerk.
Alex Boag, jr. ....	Mill worker.	P. Cameron .....	Assistant paymaster.
J. G. Lambert .....	Superintendent of transportation.	H. Cherkin .....	Men's furnishings.
J. A. Groff .....	Restaurant.	W. P. Gemmill .....	Physician.
W. H. Thomas .....	Mill worker.	J. R. Handlan .....	Mill foreman.
J. A. Lohman .....	Architect.	F. J. Carroll .....	Dentist.
J. F. Thompson .....	Mill worker.	W. R. Hill .....	Grocer.
Wilson Reed .....	Minister.	O. Marple .....	Transfer.
Chas. Devesse .....	Grocer.	Michael Pehl .....	Mill worker.
J. G. Farquhar .....	Mill foreman.	Thos. Hinton .....	Paper hanger.
J. A. Black .....	Assessor.	Peter Garber .....	Grocer.
August Karlawsky .....	Real estate.	Albert H. Scales .....	Do.
J. P. Lydle .....	Fish dealer.	H. N. Odbert .....	Real estate.
H. P. Prewitt .....	Shearman.	Frank Kent .....	Roller.
Gus A. Dregella .....	Mill worker.	W. G. Nendorfer .....	Do.
J. T. Rodebaugh .....	Yardmaster.	L. P. Phillon .....	Do.
J. A. Johnson .....	Barber.	J. H. Benjamin .....	Do.
John L. Gibson .....	Steel worker.	C. T. Lemon .....	Hardware.
O. R. Baker .....	Molder.	P. Johnson .....	Restaurant.
A. K. Saylor .....	Carpenter.	Thos. Preston .....	Mechanical engineer.
Carl Woodward .....	Tax collector.	E. O. Voyzey .....	Foreman.
R. E. Palmer .....	Dentist.	M. McMahon .....	Civil engineer.
Charles Helwig .....	High-school teacher.	J. R. McFarland .....	Minister.
Walter Allison .....	Machinist.	Ivan Odbert .....	Lieutenant United States Army.
Noah Cook .....	Mill foreman.		

These are about 150 representative citizens who were sworn in as special officers to preserve law and order in the enforcement of the burgess' proclamation, along with perhaps 750 more loyal mill men.

[Extract from Daily Independent, Monessen, Pa., Tuesday evening, Sept. 23, 1919.]

## BURGESS ISSUES PROCLAMATION TO THE PEOPLE.

I, W. B. Stewart, chief burgess of the borough of Monessen, under legal authority invested in me, and a civic duty imposed upon me, do hereby give notice to all persons within the corporate limits of the borough of Monessen that I will strictly and impartially enforce the law in recognition of the rights of our citizens for the preservation of peace and order and the protection of life and property.

I hereby proclaim:

1. That all borough ordinances pertaining to unauthorized meetings, parades, unlawful assemblage, or gatherings will be strictly enforced. Parades will not be permitted, crowds congregating on the streets will not be allowed. Persons walking along the streets must go to and from their duties peaceably and not stop and engage in conversation in groups.

2. All clubs or other places where men may congregate must close and remain closed until further notice.

3. The sale of intoxicating drinks shall be considered a misdemeanor that will be reported to the Federal authorities forthwith.

I summon every citizen to aid and assist to the fullest extent in the enforcement of this proclamation, for the protection of this community, the maintenance of the law and order and the enforcement of the rights of American citizenship.

W. B. STEWART, *Chief Burgess.*

In addition to the proclamation above, Burgess Stewart has called the citizens of Monessen to assemble at the high-school auditorium this evening to aid in the enforcement of the laws of the borough.

[Extract from Daily Independent, Monessen, Pa., Wednesday evening, Sept. 24, 1919.]

#### LAW AND ORDER KEYNOTE OF GREAT MASS MEETING THAT PACKED AUDITORIUM.

Two thousand citizens crowded into the high-school auditorium last night in response to a summons issued by Burgess W. B. Stewart for the purpose of backing up a sweeping proclamation he issued late in the day. Announcement in the schools and in the newspapers that such a meeting was desired brought out more citizens than the building would hold and the overflow was taken care of in another part of the building. Burgess Stewart presided and briefly told his message and, referring to his proclamation, asked to have it read. Great applause followed the reading of the proclamation and a resolution sustaining his hand in the enforcement of law and order.

The resolution was presented and adopted, which reads:

#### "RESOLUTION.

"Whereas our chief burgess of the borough of Monessen, under legal authority invested in me, and a civic duty imposed upon me, do hereby give notice to all persons within the corporate limits of the borough of Monessen that I will strictly and impartially enforce the law in recognition of the rights of our citizens for the preservation of peace and order and the protection of life and property.

"I hereby proclaim:

"1. That all borough ordinances pertaining to unauthorized meetings, parades, unlawful assemblage or gatherings will be strictly enforced. Parades will not be permitted; crowds congregating on the streets will not be allowed. Persons walking along the street must go to and from their duties peaceably and not stop to engage in conversations in groups.

"2. All clubs or other places where men may congregate must close and remain closed until further notice.

"3. The sale of intoxicating drinks shall be considered a misdemeanor that will be reported to the Federal authorities forthwith.

"I summon every citizen to aid and assist to the fullest extent in the enforcement of this proclamation for the protection of the community, the maintenance of the law and order, and the enforcement of the rights of American citizenship.

"W. B. STEWART, *Burgess.*"

*Therefore, be it resolved,* That we uphold his hands in the enforcement of law and order, and insure for ourselves and the community peace and the protection of life and property during this period of unrest.

And to this end we pledge him our services individually and collectively for the enforcement of this proclamation.

Mr. Chairman, moved that we perfect an organization to be known as the Citizens' Protective League of Monessen, for the enforcement of law and order, and take upon ourselves the required oath as special officers of the borough of Monessen.

When the vote had been taken to form a protective league most every man rose to his feet. The burgess announced that it would be necessary to administer the oath of office, and in sections men by the hundreds arose and took upon themselves the official oath to act as special officers and assist the police department in patrolling the streets and enforcing the proclamation of the burgess to the letter.

An overseas officer of the United States Army will have charge of the organization and squads will be formed to do patrol duty day and night, all of the men sworn in taking regular beats. This force will be strengthened by the home-defense police.

This morning bright and early hundreds of people presented the office of Burgess Stewart and asked to have the oath administered. 811  
 be given a badge of authority. Dozens of men from every section enlisted with those taking upon themselves the responsibility of Government laws. A meeting was called for early this afternoon to give men instructions and to start active patrol service.

The situation locally, in so far as the strike is concerned, is unchanged. The mills are all down and no attempt is being made to resume operations. The men are perfectly quiet and orderly. There has not been a semblance of any trouble, but the city authorities are ready to meet any emergency. The proclamation of the burgess, issued yesterday, has been obeyed by everyone and the situation here is not in the least disturbing. Pedestrians on the streets are going about their business as though things were normal. The business situation is not in the least disturbed and the streets are not at all crowded.

Donora experienced the quietest day since the opening of the strike and not a single disorder was reported. No crowds congregated on the streets nor at the mill entrances, and the special deputies rushed to the town yesterday from Washington had little to do. The only trouble reported during the day in the steel centers came from Youngstown, Ohio, where two men were set upon by strikers and badly beaten; both suffered from fractured skulls.

Three men were arrested following this outbreak, while later five others were arrested in another part of the town.

In Buffalo, N. Y., the State constabulary and strikers clashed following the refusal of the strikers to move on when ordered to. The strikers rushed into a saloon, but the troopers followed and dispersed the crowd. A number of the strikers were injured by being beat with the clubs in the hands of the police.

#### TRADE BOARD HAS ENTERED PROTESTS.

[Extract from Daily Independent, Monessen, Pa., Saturday evening, Sept. 27, 1919.]

At the board of trade meeting last night two committees of protest were appointed. F. H. Steen, J. Howard Kelly, and W. P. Kirk, compose a committee to protest the advance in rates of the local street car company, which is to be adopted October 15, with the approval of the public-service commission. The protest will be entered when the public-service commission takes up the matter and gives notice when witnesses will be heard.

The second protest will be made to Senator Kenyon, head of the committee now investigating the steel strike, and to Gov. Sproul, to remarks made by Organizer Fitzpatrick, relative to the condition of the laboring people and the pay they receive. The committee will make known the conditions as they exist in Monessen and the members who will word the telegram are C. L. Schuck, A. E. Thomas, and J. A. Loman. These committees were instructed to get down to business to-day and to be prepared to handle the work assigned to them in an effectual manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Brennan, we will hear from you.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. A. J. BRENNAN.

(A. J. Brennan was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

MR. BRENNAN. First, I may say that I am an American citizen. My father and mother and my grandmother and my grandfather were born in this country; and I am interested in this, perhaps, on the ground that I am one of the counsel in this labor movement, perhaps on that ground, and others may be interested in the further fact—I want to say to you that my sympathies were excited in this matter from what I knew by reason of being called by counsel before some of the magistrates and burgesses in the disposition of the cases, and in consequence of that I went on their bail, so that

not have to be in jail, to the amount of \$80,000, my  
 I submit I.  
 ment of as the laws of Pennsylvania are concerned, it is a common-  
 of the state, and the usual and regular way of bringing an informa-  
 zen and arresting a man is carried out very largely, excepting these  
 particular cases.

In other words, these magistrates and burgesses generally seem to be under some adverse influence, when a man is called up before them, they assume that he is guilty. You take the case up in Duquesne, to illustrate. This is brought in the common pleas, or, rather, in the county court, and when the men are up there, they ask the man—they don't say, "Where do you come from?" He is in the borough of Duquesne. They came there to go to the meeting, and the meeting was broken up before. The meeting was broken up; before they had a chance to say anything 34 or 35 were arrested. They say, "Where do you come from," and if he comes from Braddock or Homestead they are immediately arrested, and if he comes from Duquesne, it is all right.

Now, that arouses my opposition as an American citizen. This happened in the town of Duquesne. These men, every one, were taken down and fined \$10 and costs.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you up there to defend them?

Mr. BRENNAN. No; I took the appeals into the court, and the court discharged them in court, except two of these men that were in the town of Duquesne, and I had gone on their bail; and they were brought into court and they had been fined \$10, and when they were coming down to court to plead—when they come down to court they were fined \$25 and costs that very morning.

Senator STERLING. What were they charged with?

Mr. BRENNAN. They were charged with loitering—I do not know what—disorderly conduct or something. There is no need of talking what they were charged with. It don't make any difference what the charge is; they get their money.

Senator WALSH. I have been making some inquiries since yesterday about your law defining the "suspicious-persons" charge. I am informed that the law was enacted for the purpose of giving police officers in large cities an opportunity to arrest well-known suspicious characters, suspicious persons, pickpockets, and others.

Mr. BRENNAN. That is the only purpose of it.

Senator WALSH. Is it not a fact that in a community—that up to the time of this strike that is the way that that law was operated, and that in this strike, so I am informed, it has been abused to the extent of using it for picking up people who were loitering on the street, who may be going to meetings and getting into this labor union?

Mr. BRENNAN. That is the truth.

Senator WALSH. Have you heard anything about men being charged as suspicious characters before this strike in such large numbers?

Mr. BRENNAN. No; I have not heard anything about it. It is a recent thing, and the police use it when they do not know what to charge a man with. A policeman arrests a man, and he is taken to the patrol wagon, and there they say "S. P.," and that means "suspicious persons," and they put him in the station house, and they make

the record against him, as testified to by Mr. Walsh, the port commissioner. He is brought up there, and the officer, and he is half a The officer gives reason, under oath, why he arrested him.

Senator WALSH. In your practice previous to this strike how many cases of "S. P." came to your attention?

Mr. BRENNAN. Well, not very many. When I would be called in, it would be usually an important case; and they would usually be gotten out on bail. The man had not gotten out on bail—

Senator WALSH. And the man that is arrested under that statute or that charge of being a suspicious person, he can not get bail?

Mr. BRENNAN. They can be bailed, but usually they say—I will give you an illustration in this case.

Two men were organizers of the American Federation of Labor. I imagine that some fellow would come up to the place where they were shifting turns, and when they were there an officer said to them, "What are you doing here? Where do you come from?" He said, "I am at the —. I was at Murphy's Hotel last night." The officer says, "Where do you live?" He says, "I live out in Sicily, out in Washington County." The officer says, "Where do you come from?" Well, he turned out to be an organizer. That is enough.

Then they arrest him, and they take him up at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. That afternoon they sent for me, and I went to handle that, and I called up the sergeant of police, and I say, "How much is the bail for this man?" He says, "There is no bail for them." I says, "There must be bail." I say, "Who has the fixing of the bail?" He says, "The superintendent of police."

Then I call him up. He says, "I have nothing to do with that, but the commissioner of the district."

Then I call up the sergeant again and I asked him, "Where is the commissioner?" He said, "The commissioner is out." "Well," I says, "when he comes back let me know." He came back. I asked him, "How much is the bail?" He says, "A thousand dollars apiece." I says, "All right; I will go their bail. I do not care how much you make it." He says, "You will have to go to the esquire and get the bail fixed up." Then they let the men out. When you get there the two men are discharged.

Senator WALSH. Who has the authority to fix the bail in those cases?

Mr. BRENNAN. Under that—of course, the sergeant at the station is under the control and authority of the superintendent of the police and the commissioner, and it is usually the commissioner. Therefore, your difficulty lies in the fact that if they put that charge against you—"suspicious persons"—you do not get out on putting up any forfeit, but you will have to see the commissioner and see whether he will let you out or not. They will not refuse you bail.

Senator WALSH. What would be the bail for a man who is charged with loitering?

Mr. BRENNAN. A man charged with loitering ought not to be discharged.

Senator WALSH. What would be the bail for a man charged with loitering?

Mr. BRENNAN. Well, I would say \$15—from \$15 to \$25.

Senator WALSH. And how about disorderly conduct?

I sum-  
ment of BRENNAN. Disorderly conduct; well, it would be about \$25.  
of the LUBIN. Do you know anything about the cast of District  
attorney Gompers advising these men that the only way they could  
test this charge of suspicious conduct would be to institute proceed-  
ings—

Mr. BRENNAN (interrupting). I do not know anything about that.  
Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been the attorney for the  
American Federation of Labor?

Mr. BRENNAN. I have been attorney for the American Federation  
of Labor, I would say, only since this thing happened. I am and  
have been a general attorney for the laboring people, but I do not  
charge them anything.

Senator PHIPPS. I would like to ask you whether or not you had  
similar experiences during the times of the previous strike?

Mr. BRENNAN. Well, I had experience in the Homestead strike. I  
defended the Homestead strikers.

Senator PHIPPS. Back in 1892?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Were there any arrests made in the same way as  
these which are now being made?

Mr. BRENNAN. I do not think there was any. There was only one  
arrest, and that was on the question of whether or not a man called a  
scab, and the right to arrest the one who started it. Two men were  
going along the road and one called the other a scab, and the one who  
called the other a scab was charged with disorderly conduct, and  
the superior court of Pennsylvania sustained the magistrate in  
convicting him of disorderly conduct. Up to that time nobody ever  
believed that anybody walking along and saying to another, "You  
are a scab" was guilty of disorderly conduct. It did not collect any  
crowd or anything of that kind—

Senator PHIPPS. But it would be apt to provoke an assault,  
wouldn't it?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes; it was on that theory.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been a practicing attorney  
at law?

Mr. BRENNAN. For 40 years.

Senator PHIPPS. And do you practice before all of the courts?

Mr. BRENNAN. Every court in Pennsylvania and in the United  
States.

Senator STERLING. Senator Walsh asked you about the origin of  
this ordinance relative to suspicious persons.

Mr. BRENNAN. Well, the Senator described it; it was for suspicious  
persons loitering around the hotels and depots and in suspicious  
places; and that is what the suspicious persons meant, and that was  
that they were suspicious persons that would create a suspicion in  
the mind of the officer that this man might commit a crime.

Senator STERLING. Did you hear the testimony of Commissioner  
Walsh yesterday?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Suppose at 5 o'clock in the morning a man was  
found in the alley of the city here, with brickbats in his pocket,  
would you deem the officer warranted in making an arrest there on  
the ground that such person was a suspicious person?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes; I would; but I do not believe that. You know you have the testimony here of one man that had a half a brick put in his pocket.

Senator STERLING. But he testified to four men.

Mr. BRENNAN. I know he said that there were four men, and I have no doubt about that. He did not arrest the man. I have doubts about those four men. He only has his recollection, and he only has a statement of some officer who may have said that he had a brick when he did not have a brick. You also heard the testimony of a man here that had a blackjack put in his pocket.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you yourself had experience in the mills?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir; I was in the Jones & Loughlin Mills until I was admitted to the bar.

Senator McKELLAR. You were a roller?

Mr. BRENNAN. I was a roller, journal.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brennan, your time has expired.

Mr. BRENNAN. I would like to say this. I want to say this to vindicate the laws of Pennsylvania. Here is the trouble. It is a good bit like this gentleman said up here. They are scared to death, a lot of them, who have no reason to be scared. He is afraid of violence, and he is afraid of something. Instead of the officer going there and saying, "Why, we are going to have a meeting; that if anybody gets disorderly we will arrest them"—take the case of Duquesne and in McKeesport. A man goes up there and he is talking to another man, and an officer takes him down before a magistrate and that man is fined. These men are intelligent people. Don't make any mistake about them not understanding English. What is the result? It is just what I told the judge. When you are putting a bail upon these men, when they put \$3,000 bail upon them for inciting a riot. I said, "Judge, you ought to refuse this bail. What is the trouble here? Could you expect anything else? They arrested these two men for telling the men to disperse, and the two officers did not know anything about that, and they took them up to the city hall. Naturally disorder would follow.

These men were both well known. Why did not they disperse the crowd and issue a warrant for the arrest of these two men? Up here in North Clairton, Mr. Brogan is on his own lot, and he told them, "This is my lot. There is no harm being done." Well, anyway, they arrested him, and they fined him because they were holding a meeting and because they were obstructing the street. They fined them, and they would not let me give you that case about Clairton. Mr. Brogan went out and rented these lots. They were going to have a meeting. It was necessary for them to advertise their meeting. They had their meeting, but as soon as a man went to hand out a handbill he was arrested for advertising the meeting. He handed out the bills, and he was fined the most that they could fine him, which was \$25 and costs. When he was leaving the town he threw the handbills out of the car on the platform and along the pavement, and when he came up for his hearing they put on another forfeit of \$25. They had him arrested again. They had him arrested for throwing the bills out of the car, and they fined him \$25 more and costs. And in this case what did the mayor say? He said, "Jesus Christ would not be

allowed to have a meeting in Duquesne." The mayor said in deciding this case that it was useless for them to ask for a permit, and they were fined because they could not get a permit.

Senator STERLING. They were refused a permit, according to the testimony, at three or four or four or five different places, and in spite of that refusal, they proceeded to hold the meeting?

Mr. BRENNAN. But the court held otherwise—that there was no use of asking for a permit at all, because of the attitude upon the thing, and they were told that they would not be allowed to have a permit. They had this meeting. As soon as they find out that he has this place rented, Carnegie Land Co. goes and leases the place, and then they cover the whole place, the whole lot, with "No trespass" signs. They put all of the police around the outside, and when those people were coming there to the meeting these two men drove up and they put these signs in the lot; put it in the center of the block.

Senator STERLING. And—

Mr. BRENNAN (interrupting). And the chief of police arrested them.

Senator STERLING. But suppose that the burgess or the mayor, under the ordinance of the city or the statute of the State, has the authority to grant permits for any particular kind of a public meeting, and he refuses to grant the permit, whether rightfully or wrongfully, would you advise the people desiring to hold the meeting to go ahead and hold the meeting, notwithstanding the refusal of the burgess or the mayor?

Mr. BRENNAN. Let me present this case. I do not know what I would do as an American citizen, and responsible for what I did and said. Here is the ordinance. The ordinance presented as an ordinance, say in the case, as the Mother Jones case. It was presented by James W. Crawford, it was signed by the "president of the council, James W. Crawford," and it was signed "mayor of the city of Duquesne, by James W. Crawford," and in the heart of the ordinance is this, it runs, that if a request be made for a permit to hold a public meeting, James W. Crawford is to decide whether it is detrimental to the best interests of the city of Duquesne. Then the same James W. Crawford presented the ordinance, he was president of the council, he approved it, he voted for the ordinance, and as the mayor of the town he signed it, and he puts in the ordinance that he is to decide this question, and if the matter comes up to him he punishes the man who violates the ordinance with a fine, and this very ordinance contains this provision, that he can not fine less than \$25. The people have a meeting without a permit, and he took his own power away from them, and he fines this man \$100, because they did not have that permit. I do not know as an American citizen—I do not believe that is the law of the United States.

Senator STERLING. You have not yet answered the question that I asked you.

Mr. BRENNAN. What was that?

Senator STERLING. As to whether or not you would advise, notwithstanding the refusal of a permit, to hold the meeting—

Mr. BRENNAN (interrupting). Well, I would not like to say that, because I do not advise the men to get into trouble. My business is to keep them out of trouble, but if I had asked for the permit and he



refused it to me, I would be willing to say—I would say, well, we will have this fight.

Senator STERLING. Even though it were known at the time that it would mean trouble and important trouble?

Mr. BRENNAN. It was not important trouble.

Senator STERLING. Was not there another remedy by which you could get your rights, if you had a right to hold a meeting, than to resort to an open violation, in spite of the refusal of the burgess to allow you to have a meeting?

Mr. BRENNAN. Let us take another view of the case. It is not a meeting over which he had control and undertook to fine these men because they kept out in the street. The next time that you are going to have a meeting—because when they were interrogated by the court they said that they could have their own private meeting where they liked.

Senator WALSH. Did I understand that the name of James W. Crawford—that his name, his individual name—was mentioned in the ordinance, and that they had to go to him for a permit for the meeting?

Mr. BRENNAN. No; but he is the mayor.

Senator WALSH. I never heard of an ordinance mentioning a man's name—

Mr. BRENNAN. No; the mayor shall do it.

Senator WALSH. It does not say "James W. Crawford"?

Mr. BRENNAN. No; it does not say "James W. Crawford."

### TESTIMONY OF MR. C. YAJAPIZ.

(C. Yajapiz was thereupon called as a witness and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. YAJAPIZ. I want to say that I got hurt at Monessen on that parade from Denora. I just stepped out to shake hands with a fellow, and the first time he hit me. He said, "You can't shake hands with me. I don't know you." The man slapped a gun in my face, and he hit me, he struck me—

Senator McKELLAR. Who was it did that?

Mr. YAJAPIZ. His name was Bert Thompson who hit me. He is a special policeman; a deputy.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You went to shake hands with him?

Mr. YAJAPIZ. And the first time he hit me.

Mr. RUBIN. What were you doing?

Mr. YAJAPIZ. I was just on the sidewalk.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will now adjourn subject to the call of the chairman.

(Thereupon, at 11.10 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned subject to the call of the chairman.)



# INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to the call of the chairman, at 10 o'clock a. m., at Room 201, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Sterling, Phipps, McKellar, Jones, and McLean.

Also present: Jacob Margolis, 302 Ophelia Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

## TESTIMONY OF MR. JACOB MARGOLIS.

Senator KENYON. We have two or three witnesses here, gentlemen, and Mr. Margolis is here from Pittsburgh. Mr. Margolis, will you be sworn?

Mr. MARGOLIS. If the Senator please, I would rather affirm than to swear.

(Jacob Margolis was thereupon called as a witness and, having first been duly affirmed, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Margolis, we want to have a pretty frank talk with you about general conditions up there relating to the strike, and the question has been raised whether this strike is really to benefit conditions or to remedy conditions, or whether it is a part of a movement among the radical element to get control of the American Federation of Labor, and we have understood that you could give us a good deal of light upon that question.

You are an attorney, are you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Of how many years practice?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I was admitted to the Allegheny bar on the 13th day of March, 1910.

Senator PHIPPS. Were you brought up in Pittsburgh, Mr. Margolis?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I was born in the city of Pittsburgh, the new first ward, the old sixth.

Senator PHIPPS. That is down near the point, isn't it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I was born on Magee Street.

Senator PHIPPS. And you are an American citizen, of course?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I was born in the United States. My parents were living here at the time of my birth.

Senator PHIPPS. And what was the nationality of your parents?

Mr. MARGOLIS. My parents were Hebrews; they come from Russian Poland.

Senator PHIPPS. And you went to the public schools of this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I graduated from the Franklin Public School and the Pittsburgh Central High School.

Senator PHIPPS. And in what year did you graduate?

Mr. MARGOLIS. 1904.

Senator PHIPPS. And did you complete your education in some other institution of learning?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I went to Washington-Jefferson College for one year, and then I graduated from the Pittsburgh Law School, in the class of 1909.

Senator PHIPPS. And you were admitted the following year?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I was admitted March, 1910, not completing my three years—having passed the preliminary examination in 1907, the requirement is down there that you must have three years' practice from the passage of the preliminary examination until you are entitled to take your final examination.

Senator PHIPPS. And you are practicing in all of the State courts of the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am practicing in the supreme and the superior courts of the State of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a magistrate court or some other such court—

Mr. MARGOLIS. I will explain that. We have a county court, and in each ward there is an aldermanic court, and there are 27 wards, and in the districts outside of the city they are called justices of the peace; but in the city we have the police magistrate, who is appointed by the mayor. Originally the mayor used to hear all of the cases, but we now have the police magistrates, and to them is delegated the power—the power the mayor formerly had is now delegated to certain police magistrates, and they sit in various districts. No admission is required to practice in those courts.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the bar of the Federal court of the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not practicing in the Federal court of the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. And does not your line of work take you into the Federal court?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It does, but I have not been in the Federal court. We have a man in the office that attends to those courts.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you apply for admission to the Federal court and was it denied?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I never did.

The CHAIRMAN. You never did?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. Let me explain that: Mr. Orr advised me at the time that I should not do so, and I acted on his advice.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did he advise you not to make application?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He advised me at the time, and the reason was because at the time I made application I was talking to the judge,

and in speaking with him—the war was on, and there was a lot of feeling at the time, and right at that time he thought it was inadvisable for me to make application, and he said that certain people would object to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that on account of your views in regard to the war?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And were you opposed to the war?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I was opposed to the war.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you been opposed to the war after it commenced?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I have been opposed to the war all of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. You were opposed to it after it commenced?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not believe in war?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not believe in war under any circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. Under any circumstances?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Not even if the country was invaded, you would not believe in war then?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not believe in war, as I said, under any circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you do if the country was invaded and our institutions were attacked and your home was attacked?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe in nonresistance. I believe rather than to arm an army in order to meet the invaders, that nonresistance is more effective than resistance.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe absolutely in no resistance, do you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe that there should be no resistance, and that there would be very much less damage done if there was no resistance than if there was resistance.

The CHAIRMAN. Even to the point of an enemy attacking the country and taking over the government, you would raise no objection?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would raise no objection.

Senator STERLING. Even though it might overthrow the government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Gentlemen, I do not believe in using force against force, and if it comes to such a pass, I do not believe in killing.

Senator STERLING. What do you believe in?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe that human society can get along without government, and that if certain conditions prevailed that the people of this country, or, for that matter, of any other country, can do away with the causes for government, and then they would not have to have any government.

The CHAIRMAN. What are those conditions?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe that the reasons for the existence of government—these are my beliefs—that the reason for the existence of government is the fact that there are two distant groups in our society, one group which owns things and derives rewards from such ownership and the class of producers, and by reason of that division between those two classes, that government exists in order to protect

the property interests of the owning class, and I believe that the elimination of classes in our society, that there would be no need for any divisions into such groups, and when such conditions prevail government will be superfluous and unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe that capitalism and government are synonymous?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I do not say that capitalism and government are synonymous.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you believe that government is purely to protect capitalism—

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; in some places it is not. In Russia, for instance, it is to protect the workers. It depends upon what group in the country is ascendent. Where the property-owning class are ascendent, the government is used there principally to protect the property interests, where the property-owning classes are dominant. In Russia, on the other hand, where the working class is the dominant group, and where ownership is not the determining factor, but where production is the determining factor, the government is used to protect the workers instead of the owning classes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not believe in that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I do not believe in that.

Senator JONES. Suppose that some other man would conclude that he wanted your coat, and should insist upon getting it, and you giving it to him, to the extent of violence, do you think that you would hand it to him? What would you do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would hand it to him, Senator. I would not fight with him about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a married man, Mr. Margolis?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I am.

The CHAIRMAN. And if a man came into your home and should do violence to your family, or assault your family, would you permit him to do it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would permit him to it rather than to fight him.

The CHAIRMAN. And if a man came in and assaulted your wife, would you try to persuade him not to?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would try to persuade him not to; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But if you could not persuade him, then you would do nothing?

Mr. MARGOLIS. If I could not persuade him, I would not use violence; I would do nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have talked a good deal; you have been quite an orator on those views, have you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I have been speaking—I have spoken for about 15 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; you commenced when you were a newsboy, I understand.

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I commenced after that time.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have talked to various assemblages?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you talked this same doctrine to them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you thoroughly believe in those doctrines, do you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do; thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long have you believed in those doctrines?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have believed in them for many years.

Senator STERLING. And that is known as anarchism, is it not? That is known as anarchism?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, that phase of it is called Tolstoyan anarchism.

Senator STERLING. And that is syndicalism, is it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; it is not syndicalism; it is merely the Tolstoyan phase of anarchism. It is a phase that does not feel that there is any reason for resorting to violence. Syndicalism is different. That has to do with labor, and it is concerned almost exclusively with labor.

Senator STERLING. And how does that differ from the doctrine of the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The I. W. W. is an industrial movement. It does not concern itself very much with these problems of resistance or non-resistance, although they are a movement really opposed to the use of force, and not believing in its efficacy or value, but it does not deal with the ethical problem, but it is purely industrial, and syndicalism is also industrial, and the I. W. W. believes or deal with the industrial instead of the ethical conditions.

Senator MCKELLAR. And now, Mr. Margolis, please tell me how do you understand that the I. W. W. deals with industrial problems? You understand that the I. W. W. deals with industrial problems?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; the I. W. W. says that the workers must organize industrially; that is, it must organize along the lines that modern industry is organized. For instance, the workers in the steel industry should not organize in different craft organizations, but should organize in one organization. To illustrate, to-day the American Federation of Labor, in the steel industry, although they appear to be a unit, as a matter of fact, they are organized in 24 different international unions, each of which has control over its crafts or membership, and the I. W. W., on the other hand, would not have this division into 24 different crafts, with its jurisdiction in the hands of 24 different organizations, but would have the jurisdiction in the hands of one organization. Now, they propose first of all, as they put it in their preamble, to organize industry for the every-day struggle; that is, the struggle to get better wages, to get shorter hours, and to get improved shop conditions. They propose, furthermore, to build a new society within the shell of the old and not to proceed along the every-day struggle of shorter hours and better pay and better shop conditions; but they propose a new orientation altogether—the creation of a new society, based entirely upon the productive units, not recognizing that any considerations are due ownership.

That is their basis, and they propose to bring these things about; first through the organization of the workers along these industrial lines, because they feel that they will then be better able to get these things, because they present a more unified mass, and they do not attempt to meet with the employer in different units, but propose to meet the employer in an industry altogether, and they propose, whenever they succeed in organizing the workers industrially, in order that they can get better pay at shorter hours and better shop conditions, they propose to organize production units for the purpose of carrying on industrially after they have

succeeded in getting all of the workers organized so that they can take every industry and run it without any interference from above.

The CHAIRMAN. And you go with them to that extent, do you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you go farther than they do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not on industrial lines.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe in them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am not. I could not be a member. I am not a wageworker.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you are not a member?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you have never had a card?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir; I have never had a card.

Senator STERLING. You are the attorney for the I. W. W., are you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am an attorney for the I. W. W.; that is, I handle cases for them. They do not have an attorney in the sense that the corporation has a corporation counsel.

Senator STERLING. But whenever they have cases arising, they come to you as their attorney, do they not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; in that district.

Senator STERLING. And you are recognized as their attorney, are you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. How many members have they? Do you know?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

Senator PHIPPS. I would like to ask you about your various clients—you have other clients—you are a man with a wife and a family, perhaps, and your income is perhaps sufficient to allow you to have something left over after paying your living expenses, and during the course of years you will probably accumulate some capital or some money over and above what you spend on your family, and will have capital, under the conditions of the day, and that would be earning an income, would it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And what do you propose to do with that surplus income?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, under present conditions, I must make an easy compromise, a facile compromise, because I am faced with realities, and realities are here to-day, but I hope that the time will come when such a condition will not exist, and I feel that I must make a compromise, and I make a compromise, and I feel it is very much of a compromise, and it is a compromise the same as I would make if I were working for wages, but I do not believe in that system. If I opened a store, for instance, and sold you goods and made a profit, then it would be a compromise, and inasmuch as I want to continue to live, I must make that compromise. Remember, that I am not soured on the system at all; I do not feel any bitterness about things or about anybody, but I



am going to try to adjust myself with the least compromise possible, and if there is anything left over, I am going to invest it.

Senator PHIPPS. It is a communistic idea that you have, and you feel that everybody should work to the extent of his ability for the general good?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He should work according to his ability and use according to his need.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you cooperated with Emma Goldman and Alexander Bergman in these matters at all? Do your minds work together?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; there are considerable theoretical differences.

The CHAIRMAN. But you know them very well?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; I know them very well.

The CHAIRMAN. And you entertain them at your house, do you not, quite frequently?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I do not entertain them frequently. I entertain them at my house when they are in Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. They come to your house?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; they come to my house.

The CHAIRMAN. And you talk with them, do you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And are you in accord with them in general?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, that is quite a difficult question to answer, because there are theoretical conditions. They are rather communist anarchist and I rather hold the syndicalist view, I should say. They are, I would say—they belong to the old school and not to the new school and not to the syndicalist school. The old school believe that people would just naturally, without any preparation, bring about a communist order. I believe, on the other hand, I hold more of a realistic doctrine, and I do not think that there is an adequate understanding of the industrial processes.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is their view?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, they believe that things will come of themselves, without any organization; that no organization is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. And your view is that they must organize?

Mr. MARGOLIS. My view is that they must organize.

The CHAIRMAN. Just how would you describe yourself? I asked you a while ago.

Mr. MARGOLIS. First, syndicalist; I put the syndicalist first, because it is the important thing; syndicalist-anarchist would be my position.

The CHAIRMAN. And what are they?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They are communist anarchists. They believe that all that is needed is education.

The CHAIRMAN. And without organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That organization—with organization coming through education, but not with any definite plans of organization.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you have a number of friends with whom you talk this matter over?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are in accord with them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And are there any societies who are advancing these doctrines?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not say that there is any society.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of any?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I am a member of no society except the Art Society of Pittsburgh. That is the only thing to which I belong.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is the art society, Society of Arts of the city of Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. And is that all they do——

Mr. MARGOLIS. They give concerts in the city of Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is all.

Senator PHIPPS. They have had lecturers and exhibitions of pictures, have they not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it is an art society.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you belong to some literary society there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; we have got no literary society there. We did have a literary society, but they were closed up last year. May 4 was the date they were closed up.

The CHAIRMAN. They were raided, were they not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; they were not raided.

The CHAIRMAN. What happened to them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. All I know that happened to them was that they came up there one day and we found everything torn and thrown on the floor. There was never any raid.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the Keystone Literary Society?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Keystone Literary Society was a society for the discussion of social questions.

Senator STERLING. And where did it have its office?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it has no office. It had a meeting place at Second Avenue and Grant Street.

The CHAIRMAN. What building is that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Morehead Building; Morehead Hall it was called. The building belonged to a wagonmaker by the name of Lang.

The CHAIRMAN. And how frequently did they meet there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Every Sunday night.

The CHAIRMAN. That place was a sort of a rendezvous for radicals, was it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; all radicals met there.

The CHAIRMAN. And are they both English-speaking and foreigners?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it was mostly English-speaking; and all of the meetings were practically conducted in English.

The CHAIRMAN. And all of those believed in syndicalism and anarchy?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. Well, they were mostly socialists. More socialists attended those meetings than anything else, because they are great meetings—great to attend meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your connection with that society, Mr. Margolis?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I was secretary of the society.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you organize that society?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; I helped to organize it.

The CHAIRMAN. And was there a membership fee to that society?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; there was no membership fee. There was a voluntary fee, as there were no dues, really no dues for being a member, no dues connected with the membership.

Senator McKELLAR. Was Mr. Foster a member of that society?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir; he was not.

Senator McKELLAR. And did you know Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I know him

Senator STERLING. And did your society have any constitution or by-laws?

Mr. MARGOLIS. We had no constitution or by-laws; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Foster attend any of the meetings? He attended one meeting, did he not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He attended one meeting, as I recall.

The CHAIRMAN. And was he asked to speak at that meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was asked to speak; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he speak?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What reason did he give for not speaking?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, the reason that he gave was that he did not care to be mixed up with that organization at that time, because he was being attacked too much as it was.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are in rather friendly relationship with Mr. Foster, are you not, and have been for a number of years?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I never saw him until he came to Pittsburgh last year.

The CHAIRMAN. And since that time you have seen a good deal of him, have you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Why, he spoke——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You have been to see him, and he has been to see you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I was in his office once, as I recall.

The CHAIRMAN. And was he in your office?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, he may have been—I would not say positively that he was. I met him on several occasions. Particularly I would meet him at the Pittsburgh Federation of Labor meetings, the central body in Pittsburgh of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. And you and he discussed the strike, I suppose?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was there for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. And you discussed that with him?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, I can not say that I did. The discussions that I had with Mr. Foster were rather questions of theory—theoretical conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you talk over with him your ideas of syndicalism?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you and he agree pretty well?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; we did not.

The CHAIRMAN. In what particular did you not agree? What did you differ on?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, we differed fundamentally, as I would say. We differed in this respect, that Foster believed that when he got into the American Federation of Labor, that in the American Fed-

eration of Labor he could take a position of leadership, and could still maintain it when it was once inaugurated.

The CHAIRMAN. And all the while be a syndicalist?

Mr. MARGOLIS. And all the while be a syndicalist.

The CHAIRMAN. And he felt that that was the best way to do it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; and he was a borer from within.

The CHAIRMAN. That was a term that he used a good deal, "borer from within"?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; "borer from within."

The CHAIRMAN. And you thought it was the best way to bring about the thing that you believed in?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But instead of doing as you wanted to do, the thing to do was to get control of the American Federation of Labor; that was his belief?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I believed in boring from within.

The CHAIRMAN. You believed in that, too?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that any worker who joins the American Federation of Labor is a borer from within, and becomes, instead of becoming a leader in the movement, he becomes a follower instead of a leader. In other words, he must follow the policy of the American Federation of Labor, and he must lose his identity, and I feel that is exactly what happened with Mr. Foster; he lost his identity.

The CHAIRMAN. And you argued that out with him, did you, Mr. Margolis?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I discussed it with him; I can not say that I argued it out with him.

The CHAIRMAN. And he claimed that you were wrong, that he could go in there and not lose his identity and work out what he wanted to from within?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Apparently he believed that way, because he continued there, doing those things. But he did not tell me in so many words that he felt that way, but the fact that he remained in there proves that he is of the same belief.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is what you gathered from the talk that you had with him?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not believe he is right in trying to work this out from within?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, I do; but I do not believe that he can accomplish anything in that way in the movement, because I think that in order to be able to work effectively, he must carry out the policies of the American Federation of Labor, and he must lose his own views.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think that if he can get control of the American Federation of Labor he can impress his views upon them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. But he can not get control of the American Federation of Labor, because he loses his identity and becomes a cog patterned after those who are in control of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. And you believe that he was pursuing the wrong course in order to get control?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he call your attention to what they were doing in the steel strike, that they might get control?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The only thing he talked about in the steel strike was the excellence of the method employed, the method of the steel council, patterned after the packing-house council, and patterned after the federation system of the railroads. I do not know whether—

The CHAIRMAN. What was that council?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I was going to explain that.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be very glad to have you do so.

Mr. MARGOLIS. The council is a delegate body or representative body of the packing-house industry, and this council decides the questions which arise in that industry.

Senator STERLING. By whom?

Mr. MARGOLIS. By the workers in the respective crafts. It is a delegate body. These people are able to decide these questions in the packing-house industry, but the balance of power, the last word, remains in the international unions. It is an attempt to approximate industrial unionism by getting all of these people together and submitting a wage scale signed simultaneously, that no organization is to sign unless all the others sign; and, as I say, the scheme is not industrial unionism, because it leaves the power in the hands of the internationals. In the steel industry they proposed to get these 24 organizations to form a steel council, this steel council to simultaneously submit the wage scale; but it still leaves the power in the hands of the internationals to determine these questions, whether to accept or reject them. He thought that was a tremendous advance over each international submitting a different wage scale, expiring on different dates. That is why he was so enthusiastic about this council of the American Federation of Labor, in these councils, and in the packing-house council and the systems federation which is of the railroad men, as I recall; the first system federation was on the Harriman lines. It was the first time of the real pooling of those interests by the organizations.

Senator McKELLAR. Did Mr. Foster mention his previous views on this subject? Have you read his book?

Mr. MARGOLIS. To be frank with you, I could not recall a single sentence in his book. I read it when it came out, as I have read all the literature I possibly could get on the matter in the last 15 years.

The CHAIRMAN. But, Mr. Foster, do you regard him as an anarchist syndicalist?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I would say that Mr. Foster is a good trade-unionist.

The CHAIRMAN. You would regard him as a trade-unionist?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; an American Federation of Labor trade-unionist.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think that he is a syndicalist?

Mr. MARGOLIS. You do not think so. I would not say that I am certain about my opinion. It is what I could gather. I do not know exactly what Foster is.

Senator McLEAN. You said that he was an anarchist socialist?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I did not say that.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think that he has recanted from his former view—

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know whether it is necessarily a recantation. I think rather the man, being in a certain position, the exigencies of the situation have sort of shaped his views. I doubt whether it is a conscientious change of views. I think it is rather a change because of the conditions.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, he still holds his former views, but has taken a different method of putting those views in force, and that method is through the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not really know whether he holds his old views any more. You see, a man may have views focused somewhat, but somewhere in the back of his head those views will not be focused at all. - He may have these views in the back of his head somewhere, but, for practical purposes, I would say that he has abandoned them entirely. That is my estimate of the man.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you think that he was wrong in abandoning them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes; I personally think that he was wrong.

Senator STERLING. I would like to ask a little further as to Mr. Foster's views. You asked him to speak at this literary society, did you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And did you ask him to speak at this literary society several times?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think it was several times that I asked him; yes.

Senator STERLING. And did he not offer as an excuse for not accepting your invitation that he had a serious fight in his organization, on account of his radicalism, and he thought that it would be ill advised if he were to speak in that meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, he said that he was being universally attacked, and that it would not be the proper thing for him to do.

Senator STERLING. But he expressed a desire to speak? He did not express a desire not to speak?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir; he said that he would like to speak.

Senator STERLING. And he did attend one of the meetings?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He did attend one of the meetings.

Senator McKELLAR. As a matter of fact, many of the American Federation of Labor members and those in control do not agree with Mr. Foster now or with his views?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Undoubtedly that is true.

Senator McKELLAR. I saw an article in the Federation paper or journal—I think this morning it was sent to me—in which they criticized Mr. Foster considerably, and I imagine there is quite an element opposed to him in the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, in the American Federation of Labor there are many elements much opposed to each other. The American Federation of Labor is in a condition of flux. Perhaps you Senators know that in the American Federation of Labor, in the last 70 strikes, there have been 62 unauthorized strikes; that out of the last 70 strikes there were only 8 authorized ones; and that would indicate that there was a serious condition of unrest and antagonism in that organization among the different groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall addressing a meeting at East Youngstown, Ohio, last August?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state what occurred at that meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I went down to that meeting at East Youngstown. It was a meeting of the Tri-State of the Union of Russian Workers. I went down to that meeting and asked them to indorse the American Federation of Labor's campaign for organizing the steel workers. At that meeting there was one fellow who got up—a Russian who spoke Russian—and he opposed the adoption of that resolution, because he felt that the American Federation of Labor was entirely too reactionary, and that they should not indorse it.

I spoke again, and I persuaded him that his argument was invalid, and the meeting indorsed the campaign of the iron and steel workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Did anything happen to the meeting before it ended—was it broken up in any way?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir; not that meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, any meeting at that time; was any meeting at that time broken up in any way?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; this was a convention; it was a conference that I attended.

The CHAIRMAN. Of Russians?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Of Russians.

The CHAIRMAN. And it was called the Union of Russian Workers?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Union of Russian Workers; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what was the purpose of the Union of Russian Workers?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Union of Russian Workers is an organization of the Russians in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. A Union of Russian Workers?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they have any soviet plans?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, they are really anarchists at the—if you mean political or industrial soviets—if you would ask that way, I could answer it. They believe in the organization of the industrial-soviet plant. They are much opposed to the Bolshevik rule in Russia, because it is a political soviet, to which they object.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Russians—the members of the Union of Russian Workers are anarchists?

Mr. MARGOLIS. A large number of them are; I would not say a large number because the fact is that most of the Union of Russian Workers are workingmen who but a few years ago knew nothing, and when the revolution broke out in Russia a new interest seemed to come into being among the Russians in this country; and the intellectuals and propagandists among the Russians in this country were largely anarchists.

They took advantage of this change in affairs, and their propaganda reached these Russian people, and they joined the Union of Russian Workers; but to say that they are all anarchists would be incorrect, because they have not had an opportunity to study the question sufficiently to ascertain just what they were.

The CHAIRMAN. They had a convention in Baltimore in 1916 to formulate their plans, did they not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not tell you about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man by the name of Volin?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And he was instrumental in the formation of the Russian group? Who was he?

Mr. MARGOLIS. As long as he was in this country he was a propagandist and agitator.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know where he came to in this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. He came to the Pittsburgh district, did he not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, he was in the Pittsburgh district.

The CHAIRMAN. And he was engaged in propaganda work?

Mr. MARGOLIS. So I understood. I never heard him speak.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know him personally?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, he came to my office several times.

The CHAIRMAN. And went back to Russia at the time of the revolution.

Mr. MARGOLIS. He went back to Russia, and I understand that he is the editor of Goloo Truder, in Petrograd.

The CHAIRMAN. And was he an anarchist?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; he said he was.

The CHAIRMAN. And did he make any speeches through the strike regions?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never heard him.

The CHAIRMAN. You understood that he made speeches throughout that country, to the Russians, did you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not say that definitely. I understand that he made speeches, but I do not know where or when or what—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you speak Russian yourself?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you speak Yiddish?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I speak Yiddish.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you speak any other language?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I have studied French, German, and Latin, but I do not speak that very well.

The CHAIRMAN. No one speaks Latin very well.

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make any speeches in Yiddish?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir; I am very much opposed to the speaking of Yiddish.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the Union of Russian Workers, did they not start from the Baltimore convention in 1916?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not answer that, because I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what the aim of the Union of Russian Workers is, as expressed in their preamble?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have never read the preamble.

The CHAIRMAN. You have never read the preamble?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask about Polin. He was a member of the anarchists, syndicalists, in France, was he not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. So he told me; yes, sir.



The CHAIRMAN. And they passed a resolution during the war, aimed against the war, and he left the country under an order of the French Government, did he not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not tell you that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he tell you about that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; he did not tell me about that. We did not discuss any of his personal affairs at all. My discussions with him were purely theoretical.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how he got into this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know; he never told me how he got into this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know that he got into this country as a fireman on a ship?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And did he edit the Voice of Labor in this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. And what was the Russian paper—

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Goloo Truder.

The CHAIRMAN. And where was that published?

Mr. MARGOLIS. New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have locals of this Russian workers' association?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Union of Russian Workers?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; do you have local organizations in Pittsburgh?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think there are.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many there are?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. If I asked you whether or not they had an office at 2037 Fifth Avenue and 2836 Pennsylvania Avenue, would that refresh your memory any in regard to that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know, Senator, of the existence of any Union of Russian Workers in Pittsburgh or where they meet.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Benezko, the secretary?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I know a fellow by the name of Benezko.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man of that name who is secretary of this local order, No. 1.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not by that name; I do not know anybody by that name.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Erdman, the secretary of local order, No. 2?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never heard of him. I do not know him.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that these local organizations in Pittsburgh stand for anarchist communism?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Union of Russian Workers, I know; I know that.

The CHAIRMAN. They stand for that, do they?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the local at Homestead?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not. I understand that there is one there, but I do not know anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. And they stand for the same thing.

At McKee's Lock, do you know anything about the local there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I understand that there is not any there any more.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand that there has been a local there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I understand that there was a local there.

The CHAIRMAN. And at Duquesne, do you know anything about that, whether there is a local there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I understand there is not any local there any more.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there one at one time?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I understood there was. I never attended any of the meetings of these organizations. I do not speak their language, and I would not know what was going on, and I never attended any of their meetings, and I just get it from the men, that there are those organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever called upon to defend any of them for anything, the members?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have represented quite a number of them who were arrested as alien anarchists.

The CHAIRMAN. A good many of them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I think some 20.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Where did you defend those?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Before the commissioner of labor; before the inspector, Mr. W. W. Fibray.

Senator STERLING. And the question was as to whether or not they should be deported?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The question was as to their deportation.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of them were deported?

Mr. MARGOLIS. None of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have there been any decisions?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, in the case of three men there have been decisions rendered—no; four men.

The CHAIRMAN. And were those men deported, in the cases in which there were decisions?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. In one case the warrant was canceled; in one case the man was given permission to leave the country at his own expense; and in two cases the deportations were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you about some of the members of these local orders up there. See if you know them. What became of the other cases?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, they are still pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Dznov of Pittsburgh?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Russian revolutionary committee in Pittsburgh?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know of any.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of anyone being there, of anyone ever being there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never heard of any.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have anarchist literature that you sell or distribute?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Or from your office?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never sold any.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you give it away?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the well-recognized anarchistic publications?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, as a matter of fact, there are no anarchist publications in the United States to-day.

Senator STERLING. Have there been any recently?

Mr. MARGOLIS. There were before the war.

Senator STERLING. The Freeman?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Freeman is not really an anarchist publication. I would not call it that. They call it that; but I would not.

Senator STERLING. What would you call it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. A journal that is proposing to find out what the situation is in America in relation to labor. I would not say they had any definite program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Soviet Russia—do you know that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is the Bolshevik paper issued by the people in the city of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. It is being published now?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it comes through the mails regularly.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you help circulate that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you help circulate the Freedom?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Rebel Worker?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is an I. W. W. paper.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you help circulate that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever sell it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I did not.

Senator STERLING. Do you know that paper, or did you, as the Labor Defender before it changed its name?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I have seen issues.

Senator STERLING. Did you help to circulate that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That was taken in charge by the I. W. W. themselves. The Labor Defender is an I. W. W. paper, and the Rebel Worker is an I. W. W. paper, and the papers that I had charge of are the Dial, Nation, Liberator, Modern School, and Soviet Russia and Freedom. All I. W. W. papers are circulated by the I. W. W. themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you have charge of those?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That was when I was secretary of the Keystone Literary Association; and we got this literature for sale at the meetings; and when that discontinued I still continued to get copies or numbers of the Dial and the Nation—it is quite difficult to get them; and when the Soviet Russia came out, they sent them to me, and I kept them and distributed them. I did not order them; and the same is true with the Modern School, which is an educational magazine, proposing education along the lines of Ferrar.

Senator McKELLAR. Are the I. W. W. journals which you mentioned still being circulated?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. They are?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And did those papers advocate the overthrow of the Government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And did they claim that there is no need of Government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Exactly.

Senator STERLING. Well, while you did not circulate the I. W. W. circulars, did you take them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I am not a subscriber, and I very rarely buy it, because its literary productions are really not of a very high order, mere propaganda, more propaganda than literature; and I prefer to read something of literary merit, like the Dial, Liberator, and the Nation.

Senator STERLING. Do you remember seeing a copy of the Rebel Worker, that came out soon after the armistice was signed, having on the front page, "The war is over; now success to the revolution"?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They may have had that, but I do not remember seeing it. I do not believe I had read or seen more than three numbers of the Rebel Worker since it was out.

Senator STERLING. Going back to the Youngstown meeting, at which you say you addressed the conference of the Union of Russian Workers, did you advise them at that time to get behind Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I advised them to indorse the campaign of the iron and steel workers.

Senator STERLING. Did you not tell them at that time what Mr. Foster's beliefs were?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I did not.

Senator STERLING. Did you not say that he was—did you not tell them what his beliefs were on anarchy and syndicalism?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir; I did not.

Senator STERLING. And the Russian Workers—the Union of Russian Workers—indorsed the strike, did it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Union of Russian Workers indorsed the campaign of the iron and steel workers.

Senator STERLING. Senator Kenyon called your attention to the constitution of the Union of Russian Workers, or the preamble, but he did not state what the preamble contained. If the preamble contained the proposition to unite all organizations of Russian Workers in the United States and Canada for the common struggle against capitalism and government, you would indorse it, I suppose?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I would indorse that part of it which says to joint altogether for the purpose of the struggle against capitalism without any question, but when it comes to the question of a struggle against Government, I would want to know exactly what is meant by that, because I do not believe in any violence to be used in the overthrow of Government, so there would be imparted into the word "struggle" the idea of violence—if that was the case, I would not indorse it.

Senator STERLING. But if it could be done peacefully—

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would like to see a condition of society where government is unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you know the preamble if you saw it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never have read it. I never saw it translated, and I never have read it, so I could not say that I would know it if I saw it, for I have no knowledge of it at all.

Senator KENYON. I think we will put in the record the preamble, stating the aims of the Federation of Russian Workers of the United States.

(The preamble above referred to is as follows:)

Statute of the Union of Russian Workers of the United States and Canada, united in the federation.

Aim of federation.

1. To unite all organizations of Russian workers in United States and Canada for the common struggle against capitalism and government (State);
2. To aid the movement of liberation of Russia;
3. To help the revolutionary actions of American workers;
4. The moral and material aid to the organ of the federation Nabat;
5. To build up organizations where there are none, and to aid those already in existence.

Senator McKELLAR. Was any meeting that you attended at Youngstown raided by anybody?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not when I was present.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know of a meeting of that kind being raided out at Youngstown?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I have been in Youngstown when 88 Russians were arrested.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know how many members this Russian union had?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think well of this Government of the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, that is a rather peculiar sort of question, Senator.

Senator McKELLAR. Let me say this: A man of your education, a man of your mental attainments, it strikes me as the most remarkable thing that you could, directly or indirectly, act in any way against a government like the one we have in this country.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I will say this: I have such faith in our common humanity, that I believe that if we got rid of the central question, which is the question of owners versus producers, and if we could get the new ideological basis, upon creation rather than passession, and every individual in our society would contribute his work, there would be no need for any government.

Senator McKELLAR. That must be based on the idea that every person, every individual, will be perfect.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not perfect, for perfection is an abstraction. I believe, however, that we can develop our human conscience in such a way that human beings will be able to get along with each other without any extraneous authority. I believe that when the causes which give rise to friction and strife are removed it will be a simple matter.

Senator McKELLAR. But has that ever been done?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; in primitive communism; yes, sir, it has.

Senator McKELLAR. And what do you refer to; what historical people do you refer to where that has been done?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, take the hill tribes of India——

Senator McKELLAR. And do you think that they have a better situation than we have?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; that was a primitive communism. It was a period prior to the era of private property.

Senator McKELLAR. And you are against private property?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think that there is no necessity for it.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that all men and women of whom you have any knowledge have better opportunities in life for happiness and liberty and peace in this country, under this Government, than anywhere else in the world?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, Senator, I can not answer that, because I have never been in any place out of the United States, and I have no means for making the comparison.

Senator McKELLAR. But from what you have read don't you think that is the case?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, from my reading I will say that in certain opportunities we have, but in others we have not, and from what I understand from people who have been in Europe; but from my own knowledge, not having been in any other part of the world, I could not give you an answer.

I know, for instance, that a large number of people who came from Europe—Russians and Hungarians—came here because they felt there were superior economic opportunities in this country, a better chance for a livelihood, and they did come here and they did find that there was a better chance for a livelihood, but they came only as transients—the Italians and the Russians and the Hungarians—by reason of the fact that there were better economic opportunities, and when they made sufficient money they went back, and to say that those people felt that they had a better life is another question entirely, for better economic opportunities—undoubtedly they have better economic opportunities—but whether that is all of life is another question.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that this is the best Government in the world for a man to be allowed to live under, for anybody to be allowed to live, where he or she to be——

Mr. MARGOLIS (interrupting). No, sir; I can not think that at all, Senator.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that a man of your most considerable intelligence, do you think that you should be permitted to live under a Government that you despise in your heart?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think that that is an unfair question, Senator, because it does not state the facts.

Senator McKELLAR. You have said——

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have said that I do not think there is any necessity for government when certain conditions prevailed.

Senator McKELLAR. And those conditions do not prevail in this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They do not prevail in this or any other country.

Senator McKELLAR. And, of course, if those conditions do not prevail, then you do not believe in this Government. You said that you

only believed in a government when certain conditions prevailed, and they do not prevail in this Government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I say this: That when certain conditions prevail there will be no necessity for government. However, with those conditions not prevailing, I say we must set about to remedy those conditions; and those conditions are based entirely upon industrial relations, and we must remedy those industrial relations, and when we have remedied those industrial relations we will not have any need for government.

Senator JONES. But until that condition arises, when there is no need for government, we must have a need for government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. We have a Government, and the fact that we have a Government means a necessity for it, of course. It exists. Now, if you ask me as to my violation of any laws, I can tell you frankly that I have never violated any of the laws of this country.

Senator JONES. But until the time comes when we do not need any government, do you not believe in sustaining the government we have?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Now, to answer that offhand would be too much, because there are certain things which a government does which no intelligent person could sustain. To ask any man to sustain every act of the Government would be entirely too much. I take it that the Senators here are on two sides, some of them are Republicans and some of them are Democrats, and some of the Senators are opposed to very many things passed by this Government. If I were to put that question to the Senators, don't you think it should be sustained in everything? I think that they would answer, "No; I do not."

Senator JONES. But there is no Senator who believes that the Government should be overthrown.

Mr. MARGOLIS. And I have never advocated the overthrowing of the Government either.

The CHAIRMAN. You never have?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I have not.

Senator McKELLAR. I think that you testified before I came in that you were a lawyer?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And that you have been admitted to practice in the courts of Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am admitted to practice in the courts of Pennsylvania.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you take an oath?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did.

Senator McKELLAR. To support and defend the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you think that you are supporting and defending the Constitution of the United States when you advocate principles against this Government and all other government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Senator, I have lived up to my oath to support and maintain the Constitution of the United States. I feel, as honestly and as consistently as any lawyer in Allegheny County whoever took the oath.

Senator McKELLAR. But that does not answer the question.

Mr. MARGOLIS. And, furthermore, I try to make myself clear—apparently I have not—that I do not advocate the overthrow of government. I do not advocate that, I say, but I do say that when certain conditions, based upon our industrial life, are modified, as a consequence of that modification and social arrangement will arise a condition which will obviate the necessity of government.

The CHAIRMAN. And that means a peaceful overthrow?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not advocate violence. I do not believe in violence under any circumstances.

Senator McKELLAR. And the basis of your principle is a peaceful overthrow?

Mr. MARGOLIS. A disappearance of the Government.

Senator McKELLAR. A disappearance of the Government. And if the result of your teachings and your preachings is a disappearance of the United States Government, how do you make that coincide with your oath as an attorney to defend the Constitution of the United States and the Government of the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It is a very simple matter—

Senator McKELLAR. It is not a simple matter to me. I would like to have you explain it.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am working along a line to bring about a new industrial arrangement. With a new industrial arrangement a new structure is created, and with the new structure created certain consequences flow from that change. The first one of those consequences is that the Government disappears. While the Government is in existence, while the Constitution is in effect, I will do nothing against that Constitution, I maintain and uphold it, but when the new social arrangements come into being, which makes a government obsolete, I leave it, so to speak, and it is not an attack upon the Government. It is a mere advocacy of a new structure which makes government unnecessary.

Senator McKELLAR. Is not that arguing around a circle, because what you did—you mean to get rid of this Government by peaceful means, to get rid of the very Government that you have sworn before God and man to uphold and to forever defend?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not see that there is any inconsistency in it.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have not sworn before God, have you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I do not believe in God?

The CHAIRMAN. You are an athiest?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Coming back to this council, after they accepted it, or during that time, did you advocate there the same as you do here?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I merely went down there to get these people interested in the organization of the iron and steel workers. I did not go into any lecture on any question.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is the attitude of the I. W. W.? They have been helping in the strike, have they not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They have not been opposing the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. And this Russian workers' organization, or Union of Russian Workers, that has been helping in the strike, too, has it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. As an organization, I can not say they have, but the Russians have been very much interested in the strike.



The CHAIRMAN. And when you got back to Pittsburgh from the Youngstown meeting, which indorsed your viewpoint, did you report it to Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I called him up and I told him that I had been down there.

The CHAIRMAN. You called him up by telephone and you told him that you had been down there, and did you tell him what a good meeting you had?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I told him that they had indorsed the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. And did Mr. Foster compliment you on your good work?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not say that he did.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say to you in that regard?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it was merely a perfunctory communication over the telephone and I can not remember it.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you made the speeches did you make any reports to Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never made any reports to Mr. Foster.

The CHAIRMAN. And how did you happen to report to him about the Youngstown meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, that was simply a specific meeting where I got the indorsement for the iron and steel workers, while my other speeches were mere discussions.

The CHAIRMAN. And that at Youngstown, that speech was made to the Russian Workers?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That speech was made at a tri-State conference.

The CHAIRMAN. And you got their indorsement for the strike and you reported that fact to Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Foster was at the head of the strike movement?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was the secretary for the committee for the organization of the iron and steel workers.

The CHAIRMAN. And you reported it to him as the head—

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would say yes.

Senator JONES. Are these members of the Union of Russian Workers citizens of the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not think that any of them are.

Senator JONES. And how many of them are there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not tell you.

Senator JONES. How many are there in the strike, do you know?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know.

Senator JONES. How many were there down at Youngstown at that time?

Mr. MARGOLIS. There were not more than 20 or 30 men down there. It was a conference. They were down there attending a conference. This was a conference, not a meeting.

Senator McKELLAR. From what you know about it—and you live in Pittsburgh—is it not true that Mr. Foster is the real head of the present organization of the workers in the steel industry and the head of this particular strike movement?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would say that he is.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you solicited funds at different times for the I. W. W. defense funds?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. And for the various anarchists and the I. W. W.'s movements which have been conducted in this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, most of the work—the most of the work which I have done is to collect Liberty bonds and cash for bail for men who were convicted and in prison, men who were admitted to bail by the circuit court of appeals. I done very little collecting of money. I have done practically no collecting of money. Most of the work that I have done is collecting Liberty bonds and cash to get bail for the men who are in prison.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are some of the men?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I did not get all of the bail for any man. George Andrey Letina was one man.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you collecting for a sort of a defense fund for various anarchists and I. W. W.'s who might have been convicted?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. For the men who were convicted in Chicago?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did collect money——

The CHAIRMAN. Did you collect any Liberty bonds?

Mr. MARGOLIS. For their bail.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you collect any from Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he contribute anything for the bail, in the way of Liberty bonds?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. And could you give us any idea of amount that you have raised in that way?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Between two and three thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe in this general strike going along; you are for it and you are helping it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have really nothing to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you addressed any meetings, Mr. Margolis?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not since the strike was on.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, did you address any in anticipation of the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not speak in any of the steel centers on the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. But you did speak at Youngstown?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That was a conference, not a meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference between the two?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it was only a delegate body. These men came all over from the three States, and there were a lot of coal miners, and men engaged in the various occupations, and some were not workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Your heart is pretty much in the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And they think that it is right?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe in the strike in order to remedy the conditions?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it is for the purpose of getting better wages and better hours; but fundamentally it is a part of the general wave of discontent and unrest in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think there is such a wave in the country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think so; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are not opposed at all to the spirit of unrest?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think that it helps to bring about the condition that you desire? You are not opposed to it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are not opposed to the coal strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. You are in favor of it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I favor every strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You favor every strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I favor every strike.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the railroads are tied up and if the coal mines are tied up and the people are starving—

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would like to explain.

The CHAIRMAN. If you favor a strike—do you favor a strike of the farmers? If the farmers were going to strike, would you favor that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. If they have something to strike about, I guess they will strike.

Permit me to explain myself, will you?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think that I can make it clear. The strike is merely a negative weapon, and, being a negative weapon, they merely stop industry when they withdraw their labor power. There is nothing positive done. They hope to get certain concessions. I personally would like to see a condition where this antiquated weapon of the strike would be dispensed with entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that it is an antiquated weapon?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; and I would like to see a condition where this antiquated weapon of the strike would be dispensed with entirely, because personally I believe in the development of production. I believe in the workers developing the highest possible efficiency that they can, and that they should unite for efficiency in production organization; but as yet, by reason of the fact that the workers are denied the opportunity of getting together, they are denied the right to organize; I say that by reason of those facts, that it becomes a condition precedent, in which the strike is used before they can develop these production units.

The CHAIRMAN. So you are in a position where you really oppose strikes as a remedy?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes; it is not a means of transformation.

The CHAIRMAN. And you now indorse this strike because you think it helps—

Mr. MARGOLIS (interrupting). It helps to organize these men. I would prefer very much, because I am not concerned in any particular group or class of individuals, but in all society, and any disarrangement causes suffering—but in this whole question we have to, in the

last analysis, be realists, because we are facing real conditions, and the workers seem to be able only to get any concessions when they organize and use the strike. Very often it is a loss. For instance, a local strike is usually a loss, because the workers in a local craft are bound, as a rule, to be defeated.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you thought out in your bright mind some remedy other than the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your remedy?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Production organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Production organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And elimination of Government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The elimination of Government, and production organization, so that the workers will develop the power and responsibility to conduct the industry.

For instance, the Plumb plan is one in that direction in the development of the thing that I am talking about. I want the workers to run the industries. I want the workers to conduct and control the industries, and they can control it and conduct it and more efficiently than they are controlled and conducted to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. And would you let the workers build the new industries?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Sure, where there is a necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. What will be done with the capital that is now put in?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think that capital is something that is entitled to no reward. I think that it is merely an accumulation of labor and is entitled to no reward. The idea of ownership is an idea that remains over from the past century. Originally there was a direct ownership between ownership and production; that is, a man who produced, as a result of his production was able to own something, but with vast aggregates of capital which have come into existence, with groups of human beings, who merely derive rewards from ownership.

It is carrying out of the eighteenth century individualistic ideal notion, that each individual can get what he possibly can, without regard to the social fabric. I think that the theory is carried over into the twentieth century, and that it has legalistic protection that it should not have, and if it does not have that legalistic protection, that theory of ownership will disappear.

It is a simple struggle between the idea that ownership is entitled to reward, or whether the production is entitled to the reward.

The CHAIRMAN. When you lay down that fundamental that is the same proposition that the men have that agree with you——

Mr. MARGOLIS (interrupting). Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is a matter that you discuss in your meetings and from the platform?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

Senator McLEAN. When you get rid of the Government and have a great question arise of right or wrong, how will you decide it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. With the elimination of these causes for difficulties, I believe that there will be very few questions of right or wrong to

arise; and when they do arise, I personally believe they should be treated rather as clinical questions, rather than criminological questions.

The CHAIRMAN. And you had no sympathy, you said, with the war?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So I assume that you did not buy any Liberty bonds yourself?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. And you did not subscribe to any of the organizations?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not, except to the Jewish Relief.

The CHAIRMAN. You subscribed to that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I subscribed to that.

The CHAIRMAN. And, so far as you are concerned, you would have no objection to the German Army coming in here and taking over this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I would have very serious objections; but I would not use force against that invading army. I might have some very serious objection, even more serious objection than any man in this room, because I abhor violence more than does any man in this room, I suppose.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we have gone into that question, I think, already.

What was the Anticonscription League formed in 1917?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That was a league formed prior to the passage of the conscription act for the purpose of opposing the passage of that act.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that your idea?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir; it was not my idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Whose idea was that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, we had at that time a radical group, and it was the consensus of opinion there that such a league should be formed. That was a radical library group.

The CHAIRMAN. That was formed by you and by Mr. Ben Anis-man, was it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, he had something to do with it; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He was an I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think that he was a member of the I. W. W.

The CHAIRMAN. And an anarchist syndicalist?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I could not tell whether he is that or not. He is just a workman, and I do not think he has had sufficient opportunity to study and to reach any definite conclusion on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. But that radical library group got out cards for distribution in opposition to the conscription act—

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; prior to the passage of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. And it was also formed, was it, prior to the passage of the act?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; prior to the passage of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. And your mind was the guiding genius in that, was it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not like to—

The CHAIRMAN. You do not like to compliment yourself?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not that much.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any resolution passed by that league opposing the draft?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Do you mean prior to the act?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know the resolution exactly. They got out some sort of stuff.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you arrested?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I was arrested.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever tried?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the result of the case?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The case was dismissed before Commissioner Knox.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know the ground of arrest and the ground of the dismissal?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I understood that the charge was conspiring to defeat the draft act.

The CHAIRMAN. But the case was dismissed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The case was dismissed.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you act as counsel for the conscientious objectors?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not. I went down to Camp Lee for one man who was arrested as a conscientious objector, but I never participated in the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there not advertisements carried that you would represent these different conscientious objectors?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir. If they were, they were without my knowledge. I never saw any.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know the paper called the Vorwaerts of Detroit?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know the paper called the Vorwaerts of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a Hebrew paper?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is a Jewish paper.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever read an announcement there that there were two lawyers in Pittsburgh who would give free information about the draft question?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Of which you were one and Mr. Jim Marshall the other?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Marshall?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He is in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. He is in your office?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a conscientious objector, wasn't he?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He was not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir. He was at Camp Lee.

The CHAIRMAN. He was on the draft board a short time, wasn't he?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was on the advisory board, and he was sent to Camp Lee, and he was in the Quartermaster Department, I think, from July, 1917, to April, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. Thereupon it was rescinded, was it not, by the Government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I understand it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not you and Mr. Marshall carry an advertisement in the—I do not know whether it was an advertisement, but an announcement in Vorwaerts?

Mr. MORGOLIS. The Jewish paper. I can explain that if you want me to.

The CHAIRMAN. And offered free advice to the draftee?

Mr. MARGOLIS. We offered no free advice to any draftee, and it was not a pro-German newspaper. What was done was this: We offered our services to fill out questionnaires. That is what we did.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that the league you organized—the United States Protective League?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir. I never organized that. I was employed as counsel for the United States Protective League, which was a commercial venture.

The CHAIRMAN. That was to furnish all services in an advisory capacity, was it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. That had nothing to do with the draft?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no; nothing at all. It was a commercial agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, as long as we are into that subject, I thought it was with relation to the draft.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no; no.

The CHAIRMAN. That was to furnish free advice to foreigners working in the plants?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no; nothing of the sort. It was service sold to business men, and these business men could consult us on questions relating to their business. It was a purely local matter. It had nothing to do with the war or the draft, or anything.

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing at all?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. Then I will pass that. What was the people's council?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The people's council was an organization formed originally in the city of New York for the purpose of urging the earliest peace possible in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. That was based on the nonresistance idea?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; it was not. It was based upon merely the proposition of getting the United States to state the terms of peace at the earliest date.

The CHAIRMAN. And when was that formed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was formed, I think, before the United States entered the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Peace terms for the other nations was the idea, and not for the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; then it wanted the United States to state the terms of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the members conscientious objectors, all the members of this league?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that a national organization?

Mr. MAGOLIS. A national organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you start that organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; it started in the city of New York.

Senator McLEAN. You are an Internationalist, I suppose?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I will go further than that, even. I am a cosmopolitan.

Senator McLEAN. Just what do you mean by an orthodox cosmopolitan?

Mr. MARGOLIS. An I. W. W. who does not believe in getting into the American Federation unions, who believes in remaining outside and working only among the I. W. W.'s.

The CHAIRMAN. In 1918 did the Bolshevik propagandists and I. W. W. in Pittsburgh secure headquarters and formulate some plans for propaganda?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The I. W. W. held their meetings in Morehead Hall, and the Bolsheviks—I suppose that would be the general term covering all Russians of radical tendencies—they also held meetings there.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the purpose of that organization? Was it to spread revolutionary propaganda among radicals in the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The I. W. W. met there for the purpose for which they were organized, which was nothing new, and the Russians I really can not say what their purpose was, because I do not understand their language and I really do not know what their purpose was.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you raise some money for that organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. For the I. W. W. and the Russians?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, for the work and for the propaganda?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That was the meeting place of the Keystone Literary Association.

The CHAIRMAN. This was the meeting place of the Keystone Literary Association, in Morehead Hall?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There were desks there for the Russians?

Mr. MARGOLIS. You see, it was a regular lodge room, and there were desks there. I do not know that there was a special desk for the Russians. There were desks in the hall and they may have used one.

The CHAIRMAN. Each different ones had their desks?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Italians?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. There were no Italians?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Just a few, but there was no organization.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the big place, the head place of all the propagandists and radicals in the district, wasn't it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Or it became such, didn't it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. We tried to make it such. I do not know whether it became such.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get out any handbills for these different propagandists in the different languages?



Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Never?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know of anything gotten out and distributed by other people?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not of my own knowledge, no; I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you discuss at these meetings at Morehead Hall the general situation of the war, and after the war the breaking down of the Central Powers and the opportunities now of radicals throughout the world?

Mr. MARGOLIS. We discussed every question which radicals discuss as far as our limitations permitted us.

The CHAIRMAN. You discussed what the soldiers who had returned to this country would do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, but you heard it discussed at the meetings, didn't you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never heard it discussed at the meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Whether they would join with the ideas of you radicals or not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That was too uncertain a question to discuss.

The CHAIRMAN. Had not you discussed uncertain questions up there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; some of them had, but I tried as far as I could—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). That is the kind of questions we discuss in the Senate more than any other.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I tried as far as possible to discuss the things upon which we had some information. I do not personally like to discuss things about which I know nothing, and the Army of the United States was an entirely unknown quantity to me.

The CHAIRMAN. You discussed the radical movements in France and Italy?

Mr. MARGOLIS. More particularly England, because we got more information about it there.

The CHAIRMAN. You discussed the socialistic tendencies of England at these meetings?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Of labor—more about labor—because I was not much interested in the Socialists.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you discuss the question of the Soviets attaining to or getting control in central Europe? Was that one of the subjects that you discussed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not recall that it was. I do not think so. If it was, I do not remember when it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the question discussed that this was a good time for a strike—I do not mean the term "strike," but to strike at the industries of this country and talk over the plans that you had in mind? Were those things discussed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. In the general discussion that may have come up, but I delivered a series of lectures there, and the subject of the lectures was "Industrial Organization versus Revolution."

The CHAIRMAN. Industrial organizations versus revolution?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; a series of five lectures, how to build the new society in the shell of the old, and the burden of my thesis was how

we could develop the production organizations, how we could develop a responsibility upon the part of the workers, how we could change the worker from a mere instrumentality to a conscious worker, because I took the side against revolution and in favor of industrial organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember making a speech on February 7 to the Revolutionist Society? We have not asked you about that. That was another society you built up?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. I did not belong to that.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the object of the Revolutionist Society?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not tell you, except that they had an open forum and a speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you speak there frequently?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Once.

The CHAIRMAN. Once?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. I spoke about once a year.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke on February 7, 1918, you remember, upon the aims and objects of the Bolsheviki?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not say just the date, but I spoke on Bolshevism in the early part of 1918. The date I can not recall.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you say to your members that the Bolsheviki could not be compared to the Socialist Party, the Workman's Labor Party, or the American Federation of Labor before they are exactly like the I. W. W. in this country.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Which believe in the proletariat taking away all interest in the Government. Did you say that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I remember that.

The CHAIRMAN. You went into the causes of the war in that speech?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you quoted Trotsky on the causes of the war, did you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, you see, I may have said all of those things, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that sound like some of your lectures?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Some parts of it. You see, I never wrote out my lectures; they were extemporaneous.

The CHAIRMAN. You discussed the wrongs of the capitalist system of Europe and stated that all wars were caused by capitalism?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you believe that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did.

Senator McKELLAR. And do.

The CHAIRMAN. Caused by capitalism since we have had capitalism, and previously were caused by feudalism and chattel slavery?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think I stated in that lecture that it was the class antagonism, the class society, which made war possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was not only capitalism that caused wars, but feudalism and slavery by reason of this class antagonism, this class society.

The CHAIRMAN. You discussed too rather in detail what the Russians had done in abolishing capitalism?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I could not discuss it in detail, because at that time our information about Russia was very meagre.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not you tell them how the Russians had taken over all the lands and industries, private property, moneys, etc.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I suppose I did, from the information I had.

The CHAIRMAN. You quoted from Mr. Trotski's book on the Bolshevik in World Peace. You are very familiar with that, aren't you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that book being sold now by all the booksellers?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes. It is sold everywhere to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. It was run as a serial in one of the Pittsburgh papers, wasn't it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you talk anything about the United States Government in that speech?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not say whether I did or did not. I may have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Socialists heckled you greatly, didn't they?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes. They always do.

The CHAIRMAN. You attacked the Socialist philosophy?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. And you did in that speech?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I probably did in that speech, because I have done that quite frequently.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you talk to these people at all about opportunities in the United States for children; that there was a chance for the American boy to do most anything? Did you cite any instances of successes of American boys?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I probably did, because very often I do cite the successes of American boys in this connection, and I may have in that case, but, as I say, I did not have that speech written out, and I may have in this speech—that the last generation, for instance, of successful Americans, they were of poor parentage. Andrew Carnegie was not a rich man, as I understood.

The CHAIRMAN. That nearly all of the successful men in this country come from the homes of the poor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes. I think I expressed that in order to show that there was a certain idea prevalent in the country that by reason of the success of these men everybody could become successful, and I think that I attempted to show that the conditions which then existed, with the vast frontiers open, with the vast opportunities, that the chance of a larger opportunity for success was very much limited.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you try to show that there was a better opportunity in Russia?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. That the chances were very much better for the boys coming up than there was in this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You were extolling what Russia had done in abolishing capitalism?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not know enough about Russia at the time. I believe, frankly, if you would ask me now if the children of Rus-

sia, if I am to believe the stories I hear—there are so many conflicting stories and we usually like those and select those that please us—that the children of Russia are given better opportunities than any other country in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Better than the children of America?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Better than the children of America.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any children?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have two.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not contemplated taking them to Russia?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not now.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is such good opportunity there, why don't you take them now?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Things are tremendously unsettled now, from all I can learn, and I do not think I would like to go there now with my children. I myself would not hesitate to go there now. But I would not like to go there now with my children.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you really believe in your heart that conditions are better in Russia than in the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. To-day?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I do not. It is not a question of believing in my heart. I do not think they are at all better right now, so far as the condition of the people is concerned, because those people went through a very exhausting war against the Central Powers as an ally, and after that nothing but civil war, and there is a very serious condition there as the result of a blockade, and I believe that conditions are very bad in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not want to see this country in the same condition as Russia?

Mr. MARGOLIS. In its present condition?

Senator McKELLAR. When it was in the hands of the Soviets were the conditions better?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was never in the hands of the Soviets, but this external force—

Senator McKELLAR. (interposing). When it was in the hands of the Soviets, do you think conditions were better than here?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never knew of a time when a Soviet was not harrassed by this external force.

Senator McKELLAR. Suppose that they should have a Soviet rule over there as you understand it, do you think then that the conditions would be better then than they are here?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think there would be a better opportunity.

Senator McKELLAR. And if there was an industrial Sovietism, such as you understood Lenine and Trotsky to stand for, you would prefer to live under that kind of a rule than under American rule?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know whether Lenine and Trotsky stand for it. That is a very uncertain question in my mind.

Senator McKELLAR. Assuming, then, that it is a pure industrial Soviet rule, that a pure industrial Soviet rule could be had in Russia, you would prefer it to conditions in this country?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. And you had rather have your children to grow up under it?

Mr. MARGOLAS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I got away a little from what I was asking you as to these matters that was considered in these meetings, and the question of it being a psychological time to cripple the industries of this country. Was that question discussed in any meetings that were held?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not say positively that it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Or that it was not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Or that it was not.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had thought it was a good time to cripple the industries of this country, to bring about your ideas of the elimination of Government, you would not have hesitated, of course, to advise it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe in using the methods by which workers can improve their conditions, and if the crippling of industry is an incident thereto, I would say that that is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a meeting held in your office along about November 8, attended by Mr. McGurdy. Do you know him.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Do I know Ed McGurdy? Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And William Murphy. Do you know him?

Mr. MARGOLIS. William Murphy?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know a Murphy, but I do not know whether his first name is William.

The CHAIRMAN. And Otto Justh. Do you know him?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know him.

The CHAIRMAN. And L. M. Walsh. Do you know him?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know L. M. Walsh.

The CHAIRMAN. And Ben Annisman. Do you know him?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And Paul Kruvo?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know him.

The CHAIRMAN. That meeting was to lay the plans for an organization called the Workers' Defense League, was it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. When was this?

The CHAIRMAN. This was November 8, 1918. You remember the meeting, do you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not remember having a meeting with these men about that time?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have met with those men many times.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all of your same mind on these questions?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they all I. W. Ws.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think they are all members of the I. W. W.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, didn't you decide to formulate the Workers' Defense League, to make it the headquarters of the I. W. W. and the Bolshevik propaganda, and to secure headquarters? Was not Mr. Justh instructed to write the I. W. W. general offices to get supplies for 500 members? You know whether these things were done or not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. You see, Senator, that was a matter of the I. W. W. They probably held a meeting there, but I do not recall it, because I was not a member.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think the meeting was held at your office?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Probably. That was the organization's matters, and I can not recall now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the I. W. W. have meetings on your office whenever they want to?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They come up there very often. It is the rendezvous.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the rendezvous for the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the literature which was gotten up in pursuance of this meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether they secured the support of what we might term radicals for the purposes of this meeting, namely, the revolutionary propaganda of radicalism in the United States?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not say. I do not recall the meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not recall the meetings?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was probably a meeting of these men as I. W. Ws. and I was not a participant. I was probably busy about something else and was not even in the office.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it recall it to your mind if I said that it was discussed, the matter of holding the first meeting in behalf of Tom Mooney?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know there was an organization formed to hold a meeting on behalf of Tom Mooney, a defense league.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there an open meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; there was an open meeting, but I want to state that not only were these men whom you mentioned—not all of these men were members of that committee. We got members of the trade-union movement also on this committee. Mr. McMun, of the Molders' Union, and Mr. Gordon, of the Machinists' Union, and there were several Socialists on it. It was a committee made up of different groups there, and I do not know of this committee of which you speak as having undertaken this meeting. I know, as a matter of fact, that this meeting did not arrange the Mooney meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. It did not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. This other committee arranged the Mooney meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke at the Mooney meeting? You spoke at a number of Mooney meetings, didn't you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. At this meeting I think Mother Jones spoke, and I think I introduced her.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever talk to Mr. Foster about this propaganda of radicals in the United States? Of course you did not talk to him about this meeting, because you do not remember this meeting.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am rather certain that at that meeting of which you are speaking I did not participate in that. That was not the international workers' meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever talk to Mr. Foster about indorsing the purpose of the meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not recall. I can recall the Mooney meeting quite distinctly, because we had to get Mr. Murray, who was president of the district No. 5 of the coal miners, to get a permit for the meeting, and I recall that this was not the committee that arranged for the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to ask you about a few more things. Did you speak at Morehead Hall about December 27, 1917, on "What is the A. F. of L.?"

Mr. MARGOLIS. I spoke on that subject, but I can not say that was the date.

The CHAIRMAN. I may not be correct about the date, but you took the position there that the American Federation of Labor was not sufficiently radical to get results?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It did not have sufficient vision. It was only a question of hours and wages; that it did not envisage enough; that it did not actually have a program which would include any actual movement for the general development of the working class; that they were too narrow.

The CHAIRMAN. You had a program in your own mind that you advocated at that time?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I suppose so.

The CHAIRMAN. And that was for the radicals to come in and stir them up; that they were a fossilized crowd?

Mr. MARGOLIS. To get into the American Federation of Labor to give them some vision.

The CHAIRMAN. And that has been your idea about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That has been my idea.

The CHAIRMAN. And I suppose you and Foster talked about that, too?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have not talked very much with Mr. Foster.

The CHAIRMAN. Has not he told you that the American Federation of Labor was 300 years behind the times?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Or a hundred years behind the times?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. In your conversations with him did not you get the idea that he thinks as you do—that it is behind the times?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have not a very distinct notion of what he thinks.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not have.

Senator McKELLAR. His idea was to get into the American Federation of Labor to reorganize it and make it more radical—more up to date?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Originally I would say that that was his idea.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know of any reason why he has changed that idea, do you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I believe that he has been swamped. I believe that he got into organization and instead of making the organization what he wanted it the organization has made him what they wanted him.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that he is working right now to become the head of the American Federation of Labor and control

it along radical lines? Is not that his purpose and his ambition right now?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It may be; but he has never indicated to me that such was his purpose.

Senator McKELLAR. Would not you say that, from his course of action?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. That he is in that organization for the purpose of organizing it on radical lines, to make it conform to the views which he holds?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He may have such an idea in the back of his head.

The CHAIRMAN. This back-of-the-head business is what you can not see?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not see that.

Senator McKELLAR. I agree with you entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have given us the ideas in the back of your head.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have not concealed very much in the back of my head.

The CHAIRMAN. You are to be commended for your frankness. Was the I. W. W. literature always sold in these Morehead Hall meetings?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was.

The CHAIRMAN. If people did not have the money to buy, was it given to them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not very often. We are quite commercial in that way, unless they had a lot of old stuff around.

Senator JONES. How many people are there in this country who think on these subjects as you do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not answer that.

Senator JONES. Do you know of any?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes; there are some; but I could not answer how many. The trouble is, lots of people may think very much as I do, but they keep it in the back of their heads. So I can not really judge how many there are who think the way I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke at Monongahela City under the auspices of the Italian anarchists, did you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I understood I spoke under the auspices of one of the locals of the United Mine Workers of America.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have known it, and probably my question is not correct, if you say it was not.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. I would take your statement.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know, Senator. I understood that it was a local of the United Mine Workers.

The CHAIRMAN. I would not want to say that it was an anarchist organization, then. I had understood that there was an Italian anarchist organization and that you had spoken under their auspices, but you say you do not.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I say if it was under their auspices, I did not know it. I was under the impression I was speaking under the auspices of the United Mine Workers' local.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you a witness in the I. W. W. trials at Chicago in July, 1919?



Mr. MARGOLIS. I was.

The CHAIRMAN. A witness for the defense?

Mr. MARGOLIS. A witness for the defense.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember the time that Emma Goldman's magazine, "Mother Earth," was put on the fraud-order list?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know it was put on, but I do not remember when or how.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you been getting it before that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. After that, did you get it by express?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not recall.

The CHAIRMAN. Or by messenger of any kind?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the paper sent in bulk to you in any way, by express or messenger, and did you distribute it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not recall having received that in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive it in any form after the time the fraud order was put on the paper?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think I received them wrapped up; that is, each one addressed. That is the way I received them. I did not receive any bundle. I received a lot of addressed copies, as I recall it now.

The CHAIRMAN. And you passed them around?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not pass them around. I just put them in the mails. They were stamped.

The CHAIRMAN. After the fraud order?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know when it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember the Westinghouse strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you take an active part in that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I had nothing whatsoever to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN. In an advisory capacity?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not even in an advisory capacity.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was the leader of that strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. A man by the name of Fred Merrick.

The CHAIRMAN. Wasn't it McNamara?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was then business agent of the Machinists' Union, and he had probably something to do with the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You know him pretty well, don't you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not very well. I only know him casually. I met him at meetings of the American Federation of Labor, but to say I know him would not really be correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that his views about these things are the same as yours?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would say diametrically opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have anything to do with the organization of the National Civic Liberties Bureau?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir. I think that is the National Civil Liberty Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Who organized that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was organized in New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your firm represent them at Pittsburgh?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They got attorneys from all over the United States, and Marshall and myself were put on their stationery as attorneys in any cases which they might have had.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the object of the National Civil Liberties Bureau?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I understood it to be an organization to defend persons whose civil liberties had been violated.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it relate to the draft, particularly to the draft?

Mr. MARGOLIS. To civil liberties. They were very insistent upon it. They did not want to get mixed up in any of these draft matters, and it was all a question of civil liberties.

The CHAIRMAN. That would cover the whole thing, civil liberties?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, and things of that kind—civil liberties.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember speaking at the Morehead Hall in December, 1918, on the subject of "The End of Civilization"?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that along anarchistic lines?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I usually speak along those lines, and I suppose that would be very much the same as the other talks that I delivered. That is, I would not say it was the identical talk, but with certain phases of the questions developed.

The CHAIRMAN. You talked concerning capitalists there, of course, and religion also, at that meeting? Did not you discuss religion as a mere fetish?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I may have passed it by, but I delivered a lecture later on in which I treated of religions generally in the movement of the development of society; that is, showing what it contributed in the actual creation of these organizations of production organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. You rather made fun of religion, did you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not make fun of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Not exactly that, but you referred to that as you did to government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Here is the thing; I respect every human being as a human being, and respect his beliefs. The objection which I have is not so much to religion as to the institutions which have grown up on the body of religion, the churches, all of their differences and schisms and disputes, and all of those things. If a man honestly believes, I would not ridicule his belief. I have too fine a regard for human beliefs to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not question any man's right to believe in what he pleases?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But the general system of religion you do not believe in?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The churches.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not believe in the churches?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, sir. Every religion has certain basic ethical concepts which are so similar that there is very little difference between them, and if people followed those there would not be any trouble.

Senator McKELLAR. As I understand you, you do not believe in God?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not believe in any churches?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not believe in any government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not.

Senator McKELLAR. And you do not believe in anything?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe in man.

Senator McKELLAR. You believe in man?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe in man.

Senator McKELLAR. And that man is yourself?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no; in all people.

Senator McKELLAR. You know that the great majority of men do not believe as you do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That may be all very true.

Senator McKELLAR. Why do you regard it that you are the only one that is correct?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not say that.

Senator McKELLAR. There are a few others that believe like you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no, I do not mean that at all. I do not take an arrogant position and say that I know it all.

Senator McKELLAR. But you say that you do not believe in God? That you do not believe in religion? That you do not believe in churches? You do not believe in society——

Mr. MARGOLIS (interposing). I do believe in society.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not believe in government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is wrong. I do believe in society.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not believe in government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not believe in the necessity of government.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not believe very much for the people to believe in.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe in humanity as something which can do a whole lot of things without any interference or supervision, if let alone.

Senator McKELLAR. I do not like to ask a personal question, but have you accumulated any property?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have not.

Senator McKELLAR. None at all?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No property. I have saved a little money, because I live quite abstemiously and have saved a little money.

Senator McKELLAR. Would you mind saying to what extent?

Mr. MARGOLIS. A few thousand dollars.

Senator PHIPPS. I think it would be rather more enlightening for the committee to know in what form you have saved that money. Did you put it in stock or did you buy Government securities?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have bought a few shares of bank stock, if the committee wants to know, I really think that is rather privileged.

Senator McKELLAR. It is only in connection with your views.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think I made a general statement here that I have made a compromise with every human being who realizes that we are dealing with realities; that I have made a compromise, and I think things as they are, and do not take any bitter attitude of things and do not become sour on anything, and as a consequence I take things as they are and am hopeful that we will bring about

better conditions in the future. My earnings have been largely put in life insurance, because I have a wife and two children.

Senator PHIPPS. That is property.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I call that the saving of money.

Senator MCKELLAR. If you do not believe in property, and if you do not believe in properties anything, why is it that you are willing to buy insurance to lay up property for your wife and children?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Because my wife and children, under this system, if anything should happen to me, would have something to live on.

Senator MCKELLAR. Is not that so with every man and every man's wife and children, and is not that his first duty, to acquire something for the helpless wife and children in untoward years?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I carry out that first duty very scrupulously, but I believe that we can develop a system or system of society where it will not be necessary to do that, but while we have our present society I am going to do everything I can in order to protect my children and my wife if anything should happen to me.

Senator JONES. You have just said a while ago, "We will develop a system of society." Would not that society have to have some rules for its government?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not think it would be necessary to have any government. I think that men can get along without any person in authority. I believe that humanity can get along, where left to itself, and work out its own problems and without anybody punishing them, and without anybody protecting them, or without anybody holding over them any threat of any kind.

Senator JONES. Would not you have some rules to govern that situation?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Whatever regulations men would make among themselves to govern them, I believe in voluntary cooperation.

Senator MCKELLAR. That is what we are doing in this Government.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not agree on that. I am a lawyer, and I can not agree with you on that.

Senator JONES. You must have rules to govern the society, but no means of enforcing them. Is that it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is exactly it, but I would not like to put the power in anybody's hands to punish any individuals. I do not believe in punishment. I believe it is archaic and barbarous now, and I think the whole history of our jurisprudence has proved that it is archaic and barbarous, because the whole system of jurisprudence has been to get away more and more from the theory of punishment, and I believe that we will reach the day when we will look upon punishment as we look to-day upon the torture chamber in order to make men good.

Senator JONES. How can you get your consent, if you think as you say you do about government and the present organization of society, how can you get your consent to live under the present society and under the present government? Don't you think you should go to some other place where you could have things more in accordance with your views of what is right and less in accordance with the view of what is right in the view of the great majority?

Mr. MARGOLIS. There is no such place for me to go.

Senator MCKELLAR. You might try a place.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know of any such place.

Senator McKELLAR. There may be another world in which that sort of a theory can be worked out. Don't you think it would be well to try that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am a social being.

Senator JONES. Don't you think it would be a good thing for the United States to find an island somewhere and put all the people on it that think as you do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

Senator McKELLAR. We have some possessions in Asia or in the Asiatic Ocean. Don't you think if we could just deport all the men who believe as you do to one of those islands and let you try your form of government in that island, unmolested, and if some of you wanted to fight and others did not, just to let you work it out in your own way—don't you think that would be a splendid arrangement?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, Senator.

Senator McKELLAR. Why do you want to engulf everybody else in your unfortunate belief?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not want to say that the Senator is dealing in levities.

Senator McKELLAR. I am dealing with a very serious thing, and I think that it is what this Government ought to do.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I just want to say that there is just this about it, that were it not for people, for men who held views that were new ideas in this world, from time immemorial, that we would be a very backward people. In my study I found, for instance, in the literature of biology, that when Charles Darwin proposed his new theories, he was as viciously attacked by everybody who believed in the then existing cosmology and the then existing world order, but as a consequence of this man who believed in those things, to-day every scientist of any note accepts the Darwinian theory as the basis for his work, and if you go over the whole history of humanity, you will find that it is these men who held different views from the current views who made the progress possible. Were it not for these men we would probably be eating worms to-day.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that if we were to adopt the views that you entertain, it would not be but two or three generations before every man who was living would be eating worms and nuts or acorns, or whatever they could get?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. I honestly believe that if my views would be put into practice, in a few generations we would have a very much happier humanity than we have.

The CHAIRMAN. You evidently are not correct.

Senator McKELLAR. Not on that.

Senator PHIPPS. To go back to the practical for a minute, you among your statements included one that the working men are denied the right to organize. To what extent do you think interference with the right to organize exists in the United States? We have numbers of labor unions?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know, but in this steel organization, for instance, in the city of Duquesne, for instance, they passed an ordinance requiring the issuance of a permit for any kind of a meeting, and they would not grant permits to anybody who was going to hold a labor meeting. They absolutely refused to do that.

Senator PHIPPS. That was for public meetings on the streets!

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

Senator PHIPPS. Even in the labor union hall?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Any kind of a meeting in a hall; and they refused to grant those permits when they were asked for by labor. When this organization originally came into the city of Pittsburgh and they undertook to hold meetings, they found every possible obstacle placed in their way in the holding of meetings. If they rented a hall, the burgess or the mayor of the town refused to grant a permit. If they succeeded in overcoming the objection of the mayor and the burgess and the hall keeper, the board of health would step in. So they found it impossible almost to hold meetings, so that they had to undertake there what they called a free speech in order to get their constitutional rights of free speech. If the authorities in those communities would have permitted those men to hold meetings and permitted those men to organize, then I would say that there are no restraints placed upon men attempting to organize, but I know as a matter of fact that these restraints have been placed upon these men in attempts to hold meetings.

Senator PHIPPS. Were those ordinances passed after the strike had been declared?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Or previous to that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no; before.

Senator PHIPPS. Speaking of a board of health, was it not the fact that there was an epidemic of flu on at that time and all public assemblages were interfered with?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think the flu epidemic was on. No; I think it was over at that time, Senator.

Senator PHIPPS. In my State it was not only a matter of preventing the congregation of people in halls or other public places of assemblage, but even open meetings on the street were prohibited by the boards of health, and in some of the communities the customers of grocery stores were only permitted to go to the doorway and place their orders and have the goods handed out to them to prevent them meeting in the store.

Mr. MARGOLIS. But, as I say, Senator, I think that at the time this meeting was prevented the flu epidemic was over. I am not sure as to whether that is correct, but I think it was over, because the steel committee did not undertake to do anything during the flu epidemic, because they knew that no public meetings were permitted.

Senator PHIPPS. How many different organizations—I mean classes of labor organizations—are there? That is to say, we, of course, understand that the trades-unions, 24 internationals, are all affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. What are there outside of those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. In the strike?

Senator PHIPPS. Well, in the Pittsburgh district, where you live, for instance?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Do you mean in the strike or do you mean there are any other organizations?

Senator PHIPPS. I mean, are there any other organizations?

Mr. MARGOLIS. There are the brotherhood organizations—that is, railroad workers—and there are a few I. W. W. in the district.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. And then there are the other locals of the American Federation of Labor; that is, those belonging to the building trades and those belonging to the miscellaneous trades, which are not in the strike.

Senator PHIPPS. But they are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. With the American Federation of Labor.

Senator PHIPPS. All of those?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. What I was trying to get at was, what others there are, if any, that are not affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The I. W. W.—that is all.

Senator PHIPPS. There is one other I have heard of, the United Labor League. Do you know of that—the western Pennsylvania organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is really not a labor organization, as I understand it. I think there is still an old local of the Knights of Labor.

Senator PHIPPS. That is another I was going to inquire about.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think they have a Tobacco Warehouse local.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think that is about all there is of the K. of L. It has practically passed out altogether. It has no value at all as a functioning organization.

Senator PHIPPS. But has not this United Labor League an organization of lodges where workmen are members?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know of any. They may have, Senator, but I do not know of any.

Senator PHIPPS. Has there been any concerted effort or attempt made to extend this strike that has been on in the steel industry since September 22 to other industries?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not to my knowledge.

Senator PHIPPS. We see things in the papers occasionally about the possibilities of sympathy strikes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. That was very much talked about, but to my knowledge there was no action taken by any other organization to call a strike in sympathy with the steel workers.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you know of any effort on the part of the Federation of Labor to induce workers in other industries to strike in order to aid this steel strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I know of none.

Senator PHIPPS. Would you be in position to know of that movement?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would not be in any position to know of it.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to take you back now to the relationship between you and Mr. Foster. You have not any reason for not being just as frank with us about that as you have been about everything else, have you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think I have been just about as frank about everything else.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been frank about everything.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am about Mr. Foster.

The CHAIRMAN. You say he attended one of these meetings, but did not speak at the meeting?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He did not participate in the discussion. I spoke at the meeting which he attended.

The CHAIRMAN. And you asked him to speak at that meeting and he refused?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir; I requested him to speak. It was an open forum and we wanted various speakers to give their views. As a matter of fact, the boys wanted Mr. Foster to come down there for the particular pleasure of tearing him to pieces, so to speak, to tear his ideas to pieces.

The CHAIRMAN. After that literary association broke up, you had occasion to see and meet Mr. Foster quite often?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not often. My meetings with Mr. Foster were at the Pittsburgh Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. You attended a conference of the iron and steel workers at Pittsburgh held at the Labor Temple on May 25, 1919?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Foster was there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, sure; he was secretary of the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did that conference last?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It started in the morning, I think, at 10 o'clock and lasted until about 7 in the evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you stay there all day?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I came in at the lunch hour. I got there about 1 o'clock and stayed until 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you address the conference?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not a word.

The CHAIRMAN. You left the Labor Temple that night with Mr. Foster, did you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. And you and he had a conference running until after midnight?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would not call it a conference. We discussed these questions, these theoretical conditions at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. From shortly after 7 o'clock until midnight?

Mr. MARGOLIS. We went to dinner together, and after dinner I walked out with him.

The CHAIRMAN. Walked around?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Walked out to where he lived.

The CHAIRMAN. Walked out to where he lived?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He lived in the same direction I did.

The CHAIRMAN. And you stayed there until after midnight?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think it was after midnight.

The CHAIRMAN. He laid at that time before you his complete plans, did he not, about the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What he proposed to do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. Mr. Foster, from what I gathered from him, was under the impression that the Steel Corporation would not ever permit this to go to a strike. He thought frankly that the Steel Corporation, as I got it from him, would rather permit the American Federation of Labor to organize than to take the chance of the fail-



ure of the A. F. of L. and then have to deal with the I. W. W., because he said that the Steel Corporation would feel that they were dealing with a group of men who were not demanding as much as the I. W. W. would demand.

The CHAIRMAN. They had rather deal with them than the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That if they did not deal with them, that the contingency might arise that they would have to deal with the I. W. W., and that the Steel Corporation would prevent the strike, would not permit a strike to take place.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did he feel that they would have to deal with the I. W. W.? Was that because of the prominence in the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. He thought that the A. F. of L. would probably fail in their attempt to organize the steel workers, and as the result of their failure a new organization would take its place, and that would be the I. W. W., and that in order to obviate this possibility they had rather deal with the A. F. of L.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the position Mr. Foster took?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is the position that Foster took.

The CHAIRMAN. Was not he as well satisfied to have the radicals take possession of the strike as the A. F. of L.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. He really wanted the A. F. of L. to carry on the strike, did he?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, sure; undoubtedly. You know he is very hostile to the I. W. W.

The CHAIRMAN. He was hostile to the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He is very hostile to it.

The CHAIRMAN. He is?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; on theoretical grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you discuss with him that night about getting the I. W. W. people behind the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I told him that all the elements in Pittsburgh would cooperate with them—not in the strike, in the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. That meant the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he object to that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he so hostile to the I. W. W.'s that he did not want their help?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. He wanted you to get the I. W. W. behind the strike, didn't he?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I volunteered it.

The CHAIRMAN. You volunteered to do it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I volunteered that the I. W. W. would not interfere with the plans of the steel committee.

The CHAIRMAN. They would help in the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not in the strike, in the organization; do as much as they could to get the workers to organize in the steel plants.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is what you agreed to that night at the place where Mr. Foster lived?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was not an agreement. We discussed it.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the talk. You did not have any agreement?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. And you left there that night with that idea in your mind, and then you conveyed that to the different organizations that you were closely associated with in the city?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I conveyed it to every person that I possibly could, and I told them to do everything they possibly could to help the campaign in the iron and steel works, not to take any position against them.

The CHAIRMAN. What organizations did you convey that word to?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No organizations. I did to individuals who represented organizations.

Senator McKELLAR. Did Mr. Foster submit to you in conference the question of postponing the strike as requested by the President to Mr. Gompers?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you ever have any talk with him about that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I can not recall that I ever had any talk with him about that.

Senator McKELLAR. You were opposed to postponing the strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I was not opposed to postponing the strike. I had nothing to do with the strike.

Senator McKELLAR. You had nothing to do with that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. You understand, officially I am persona non grata with the strike committee.

The CHAIRMAN. After your conversation and talks with Mr. Foster, the union of Russian Workers, the I. W. W., and the Anarchists did act upon Mr. Foster's suggestion with regard to this strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They did everything they possibly could to help organize the iron and steel workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you yourself take applications for membership?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never took an application.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever have any of the blanks?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never did have a blank. The most I did was to buy a button for 50 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Vincent St. John?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. What position does he occupy?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He occupies no position now. He is working a mine in Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. He is working a mine in Arizona?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; and he sold some of the stock.

The CHAIRMAN. And you still like him, do you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he formerly the secretary of the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he a pretty good friend of yours?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I know him. I can not say he is a very good friend of mine. I have not seen him very many times in my life.

The CHAIRMAN. You must have been if you bought stock from him. He was in Pittsburgh in July of this year, wasn't he?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I could not be sure about that date, but he was in Pittsburgh several times last summer.

The CHAIRMAN. And he was helping all he could in the campaign?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. I could not say that he did anything in this campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Was not he advising the I. W. W.s to get behind Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing of that kind?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. He did not come there for that purpose at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he there to get bail for any I. W. W.s?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes. That is what he was there for.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you think that was the purpose of his mission or did he have something else to do?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know. He may have had something else. He never made it plain to me.

Senator McKELLAR. He might have had some other purpose in the back of his head?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He may have had.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he get Liberty bonds for bail?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He got some Liberty bonds for bail at Bentleyville. I was at the meeting with him.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether he got one from Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You never heard Foster say?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Mr. Foster never told me that he gave any Liberty bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is apparently a copy of a letter from Mr. St. John to you in August. I would like to have you look at it and see if that is a correct copy. Let me ask you first: Was Mr. St. John a friend of Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They knew each other. I do not know that they were friends at all, though.

The CHAIRMAN. How long had it been since he was secretary of the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, it is probably five years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that one of your letters?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I received such a letter.

The CHAIRMAN. You note the reference there to Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that Mr. St. John was not there on account of the strike at all?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, he never told me he was there on account of the strike. I understood he saw Mr. Foster when he was in Pittsburgh, but I did not know that he was there on account of the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. This letter would rather indicate that he had some interest in the strike, would it not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It would indicate that he had some interest in the strike, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you communicate to Mr. Foster the contents of this letter?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did not. I never mentioned it to Mr. Foster.

The CHAIRMAN. You never mentioned it at all to Mr. Foster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. He suggested to you to talk matters over with Mr. Foster. Let us read it:

Anent that article I was to mail you.

What was that article?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It was an article written by an efficiency engineer by the name of Porter.

The CHAIRMAN. With relation to what?

Mr. MARGOLIS. On the question of industrial democracy, on the question of how we could bring about through production organization industrial democracy. It was an article originally published in the New York World. Mr. Porter was interviewed by a reporter of the New York World, and he gave his ideas on what was necessary in order to bring about industrial democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. You had been talking that over with Mr. St. John?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Mr. Foster there when you were talking about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

they want to reproduce it in Sol.

That is "Solidarity?"

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

They want to reproduce it in Sol. here, so I let them have it, after which they promised to mail it to me, and I will see that you get it, that is, if they do not run it. If they do, of course you will see it in the Sol.

I will put this whole letter in the record, so the reporter need not try to take it down.

Things are looking a little better here, and from press reports, there is something stirring throughout the country.

Just while I think of it, if you have a chance to talk matters over with Foster on possible developments in case of a strike in steel, I think it would be a good thing to do so. It might be possible to frustrate treacherous action by international officials should a strike occur, and I think a strike is assured.

What did he mean by "treacherous action by international officials"?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He meant this, that if the strike developed to a certain point, and certain international organizations would make certain concessions, that they would take these concessions and forget about the other unions; that is, the more powerful ones would take the concessions that would be given them and would forget about the weaker organizations, and this whole organization plan was that every one would come in at the same time and not have any splitting up of the international organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. What did Mr. St. John really have to do with this strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. Then why did he say that "I think a strike is assured."

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, from present reports—he was out in Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. This letter was written from Chicago.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, he was in Chicago at that time, but he intended to go to Arizona after that.

The CHAIRMAN. This man St. John was writing you and wanting you to talk matters over with Foster, and he has been an I. W. W. for years, has he not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And is now?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He can not be a member now, because he is a mine operator.

The CHAIRMAN. He has joined the capitalist class?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He is not very much of a capitalist.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the date of that letter, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. August 16 of this year. I have here a book which I expect you are familiar with, by Vincent St. John, on "The I. W. W.; Its History, Structure, and Methods."

Senator PHIPPS. Pardon me. He stated in that letter "that there is something stirring throughout the country."

Mr. MARGOLIS. He meant things were stirring in the country; that is, labor unrest.

Senator PHIPPS. That is the way you interpret that remark in his letter?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were always glad when those things were started, because it was working toward the ultimate problem?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not say that I am displeased when I see the workers getting rid of their old ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the I. W. W. behind the coal strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know of any connection with it.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know of any connection with it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Except that I would say that there are very many members of the I. W. W. in the coal industry to-day.

Senator McKELLAR. You believe they are behind the strike, don't you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think so?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; this strike—

Senator McKELLAR. I mean the coal strike.

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is what I am talking about. This strike is one of the mine workers.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think it has the cooperation and the entire sympathy of the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Undoubtedly.

Senator McKELLAR. And has it not got yours?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Undoubtedly.

Senator McKELLAR. And all of you who believe in anarchy, aren't you behind this coal strike and any other strike which you can get up?

Mr. MARGOLIS. As I explained—I do not know whether you were in the room at the time—that, so far as strikes are concerned, I wish they would not happen, because I look upon them as a negative weapon.

Senator McKELLAR. I heard you say that.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I had rather see the development on the part of the workers so that they would be able to effect their production organizations, but inasmuch as it is in the course of events—these things happen whether we want them or not, because men are going to use the instruments at hand and use the strike as an instrument at hand, and do not know of any better method.

Senator McKELLAR. So you favor it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. I do not think you stated whether you believed in a farmers' strike. Suppose the farmers of the country all struck and did not produce, and there would be no food. Do you think that would help your tendencies, and would you be in favor of that kind of a strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. If the strike had some definite purpose, in order to help the farmers. Understand, Senator, that I do not favor strikes merely as a wanton use of the power that man has to withdraw from labor. If the strike does not have certain definite purposes from which these men hope to benefit, I am as much against it as anybody could be, but I say that men use the instruments at hand, and they use this because they think that through that instrumentality they can gain certain benefits for themselves.

Senator McKELLAR. What is the benefit they expect to gain in this steel strike?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They expect to get shorter hours; they expect to get better pay.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that the pay they get in the steel industry is remarkably good pay?

Mr. MARGOLIS. It may be remarkably good pay, but it is not enough pay.

Senator McKELLAR. It is better pay than they have ever gotten before in the history of the industry.

Mr. MARGOLIS. That may be very true, but they ought to get better pay.

Senator McKELLAR. You would be willing for them to take it all, would you not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would.

Senator McKELLAR. So it is not a question of whether it is good pay under existing conditions, but your belief is that you ought to go on and get better pay and better pay until you get it all?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to go back to this St. John matter. •

Senator JONES. You said some little time ago that in your talk with Mr. Foster, Mr. Foster thought there would be no steel strike, because the Steel Corporation would conclude it was much better to deal with the American Federation of Labor than the I. W. W. What reason was there for believing that the Steel Corporation would have to deal with the I. W. W. if it did not deal with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I explain that in this way, that he believed that if the American Federation of Labor was not able to gain something for the men, that the men would become disheartened with the American Federation of Labor, and would therefore form a new organization, which would enable them to get better results.

Senator JONES. What was the basis for that thought, that the I. W. W. would organize the steel industry if the American Federation of Labor did not. What was the basis for that assumption?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Because the men would want organization, and since the American Federation of Labor could not get the things they wanted they would devise some other means.

Senator JONES. How do you know that the men wanted organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I took his word for it, that they wanted organization. I assumed that, as a condition precedent, that the men wanted organization. I did not question that at all, that the men wanted organization.

Senator JONES. Were they wholly without an organization prior to Mr. Foster's activities?

Mr. MARGOLIS. There were certain welfare organizations, as I understand, but there were no labor organizations.

Senator JONES. What symptoms were there of wanting other organizations?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The men in the steel industry responded to these men as soon as they came. I do not know what particularly brought them into the steel industry, but they claimed when they came there that wherever they went the men in the industry acclaimed them and were very happy to have them there; and they had no difficulty, for instance, in organizing at Gary and Johnstown and numerous other places; and when they came to Pittsburgh they went upon the same assumption; that is, that the people wanted an organization in these districts, and they wanted to organize in the Pittsburgh district, and that the people were clamoring to go into an organization. I personally never attended a meeting of these organizers, so I can not say personally whether the people wanted them or not. I do not know, but they told me that they did want them.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to go back to where we left off on the St. John matter, the man who wrote this letter and published this book, and see if you discussed with him at different times these matters. On page 10 of this book I find this:

There is but one bargain that the I. W. W. will make with the employing class—complete surrender of all control of industry to the organized workers.

You have talked that over with Mr. St. John?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never discussed anything in that book with Mr. St. John.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe in that doctrine, don't you, though?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 15:

As a revolutionary organization the Industrial Workers of the World aims to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of "right" and "wrong" does not concern us.

Again:

No part of the organization is allowed to enter into time contracts with the employers. Where strikes are used it aims to paralyze all branches of the industry involved, when the employers can least afford a cessation of work—during the busy season and when there are rush orders to be filled.

Again on page 16:

Falling to force concessions from the employers by the strikes, work is resumed and "sabotage" is used to force the employers to concede the demands of the workers.

I understand you do not believe in sabotage?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not. I believe in efficiency and not sabotage. I think sabotage is an instrument used in our modern society, when the employers do not have profitable markets, and they curtail their production and wait for a more favorable market to them.

The CHAIRMAN. But Mr. St. John is a believer in this.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think Mr. St. John has changed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think every I. W. W. has changed in the tactics they believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. Again, on that same page:

In short, the I. W. W. advocates the use of militant direct action tactics to the full extent of our power to make good.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Direct action means economic action, as distinguished from political action.

The CHAIRMAN. And you believe in that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

At the present time the organization has 14 publications of its own use, 12 weekly and 2 biweekly in the following languages: English three, and one each in French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Polish, Slavish, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Swedish, and Jewish. A Spanish weekly and an Italian weekly are affiliated with the organization. One Russian weekly and an English monthly review are sympathetic, and a Finnish daily paper is consistently advocating the principles as set forth in the preamble.

The general organization issues leaflets and pamphlets from time to time and aims to build up and extend educational literature in all languages as fast as the resources of the organization permit.

The unions and their industrial branches hold educational meetings in halls and on the streets of the industrial centers. Reading rooms and halls are maintained by all the larger branches. Revolutionary literature is kept on file.

You know that to be true, don't you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I. W. W. literature is kept on file? Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. That is revolutionary, is it not, as we understand revolution, whether it be peaceful or not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. There is a very great difference between us.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator McKELLAR. Let me ask a question right there, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Senator McKELLAR. The other day, in examining Mr. Foster on his little red book, which you probably have seen, on "Syndicalism," the question of whether he believed in truth arose. Do you believe in truth?



Mr. MARGOLIS. If you mean by truth as Spencer defines it, I would say "yes."

Senator McKELLAR. Take "truth" as Webster defines it, do you believe in that kind of truth?

Mr. MARGOLIS. If you will permit me, Senator, I would like to explain.

Senator McKELLAR. Surely.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Truth is an abstract word. It is an abstraction. If you mean absolute truth, we know nothing about it. We talk about relative truth. Spencer, for instance, defines truth to be the inability to conceive of the negative of a proposition. Whenever I can not conceive of the negative of a proposition, then I call it "truth," but whenever you say to me, "Do I believe in truth?" I can not say "yes," because I do not know what truth you are referring to.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you believe in truth as described in common parlance or in the dictionary by Webster?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I believe in being truthful.

Senator McKELLAR. But you do not believe in truth?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Not as an abstract thing.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you believe in honor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. There is another abstraction.

Senator McKELLAR. You just believe in it as an abstraction?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I do not believe in it as an abstraction. I believe in it as a concrete proposition. I believe in these things in the concrete. The word "honor" is an abstraction. Under different conditions a thing is honorable and under other conditions it is dishonorable. We can only speak about those words in their concrete sense, under certain conditions, under certain relations.

To illustrate would be very much better. For instance, among certain primitive peoples, we find it in India, a wife was required to immolate herself, to sacrifice herself, upon the bier when the husband died. Among those people it was dishonorable if a wife should not immolate herself. We, on the other hand, would look upon that as an atrocity for a wife, by reason of her husband's death, to immolate herself.

For instance, Spencer speaks in his Sociology, of a woman among the numerous wives of a chieftain who was induced by an English woman to run away and not be burned with the rest of the wives, but the idea of honor in that woman was that she had to immolate herself with her husband and the other wives, and that was so strong that she left this woman who had rescued her and went back and was burned.

So, when we discuss these things, we must discuss them not as abstract things, but purely as concrete things.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, let us discuss them as concrete. As I recall Mr. Foster's testimony, it was that he said that truth and honor and religion and honesty were all relative terms, and that all could be disregarded in arriving at the end; that they were all means, that any means could be used—that is, a denial of all these things could be used—if necessary to accomplish the end. If a man, in other words, who believed in syndicalism desired to reach a certain end, that he did not object to lying; he did not object to violence;

he did not object to anything. I understand that you do object to violence, but you do not object to the other means of securing your ends.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I say that these words are all relative, but I do believe in doing no acts which are antisocial. I think that will explain it. I believe in no antisocial acts, because the conception is not a class conception or a social conception. I would rather say that I am socially conscious, and therefore would use means only which were not antisocial in character. I think that would answer very clearly.

Senator McKELLAR. But your belief is that all of these terms——

Mr. MARGOLIS (interrupting). Are relative.

Senator McKELLAR (continuing). Of truth, honor, and virtue——

Mr. MARGOLIS (interposing). Are relative.

Senator McKELLAR (continuing). And fair and square dealing are all relative?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Because, when you go among certain primitive people they will give you a woman for the night. We would not think of such things at all. A man who would give you a woman for the night would be looked upon as a sort of a rapsallion among his neighbors.

Senator McKELLAR. I do not agree with you at all.

Mr. MARGOLIS. But it is a fact.

Senator McKELLAR. I think you and Mr. Foster are both very, very wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember the letter written by Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Foster and others as to the reasons why the strike could not be postponed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I remember reading it in the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. A letter to the President?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And articles 9 and 10 were:

9. That an organized propaganda for vilification of the American Federation of Labor, spreading rumors that the strike will be delayed, and that such delay is only a sellout.

10. Showing no opposition to the men joining dual organizations. As a result of this propaganda, the I. W. W. is making rapid headway in some of the districts.

That was one of the reasons stated by them in the letter to the President. I refer to the letter to the President. After that came out in the papers, did not the radical men whom you have talked with and advised to get behind Foster and the strike, raise great objection to those two sections?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Have you section 11 there in the letter?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Read that.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

That the real reason for opposition to organized labor representation on behalf of the men who have grievances is that the steel industry is preparing to cut wages and to lower the standards to prewar times, and to return to a condition that encouraged the padrone system, so prevalent in that particular industry.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I thought that was the section.

The CHAIRMAN. I wondered if the tenth section is not what you mean?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; maybe that is it.

The CHAIRMAN (reading:)

Showing no opposition to the men joining dual organizations. As a result of this propaganda the I. W. W. is making rapid headway in some of the districts.

That was one of the reasons suggested to the President why the strike could not be postponed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not they ring you up and talk to you about that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; they did.

The CHAIRMAN. And find great fault with that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; they did.

The CHAIRMAN. And did not they want to know what Mr. Foster's interpretation of that was?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They did.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you not then telephone Mr. Foster about it and ask him about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He said he knew nothing about it.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he knew nothing about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He said he had nothing to do with the drafting of it.

The CHAIRMAN. You found fault with that yourself, did you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you called up Mr. Foster you were a little, not harsh with him, but you found fault with him?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I said I did not think it was fair.

The CHAIRMAN. Not fair to the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Because what you wanted was for them to make headway?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I wanted the laboring men to make headway.

The CHAIRMAN. And when they gave a reason to the President to continue this strike or postpone it, that it would help the I. W. W., you resented that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, it was an attempt to shift the burden on the I. W. W., when they were not responsible.

The CHAIRMAN. And they had been loyal in the matter up to that time?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they had helped to organize and done everything they could?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They had kept faith?

Mr. MARGOLIS. They had kept faith.

The CHAIRMAN. And you felt that this was a breaking of faith with them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was not Mr. Foster rather apologetic about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, he said he knew nothing about it, and he was

sorry if anything was said of that kind; that it should not have been said.

The CHAIRMAN. And he said these things were written without his knowledge?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Without his knowledge. It was drafted, and he did not know about it.

The CHAIRMAN. And he asked you to tell these men that he was still with them and they need not worry?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; he did not say that. He said he did not think this was a time for those people to show any feeling of resentment.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not he say to you over the telephone that he had to go along with the committee and allow them to put out this stuff, but that he had never personally seen this letter, which was written without his knowledge, and to tell the bunch that he was still with them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not remember the last part of that, Senator. I know that almost sounds like the conversation—the first part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Over the phone?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Over the phone.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that that conversation did not take place?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, no. I say that last part of that I do not recall him saying.

The CHAIRMAN. How much of what I have said do you recall that he said to you over the phone?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That he had nothing to do with the writing of it; that the committee was conducting the thing; that he was busy with other affairs; and that it was drafted without his knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not he say that he had to go along with the committee and to tell the boys that he was still with them?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was working there—that is, the internationals had control of the thing, and he had to go along.

The CHAIRMAN. Whether he wanted to or not?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Whether he wanted to or not.

The CHAIRMAN. But his talk to you was that he did not really want to go along, but he had to do it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He did not want to go along on that attack, if it could be considered as an attack on the I. W. W.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not want anything to happen which would offend the I. W. W.?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And yet felt free to talk with him about it because you had talked with him about it before?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Because I had spoken with him about it.

The CHAIRMAN. And you felt that you had kept the faith in lining up the I. W. W. for the organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know why you were not employed up there during this night as counsel instead of Mr. Rubin?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I do not know, but I have my own reasons for believing why I was not. But I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Foster talk to you about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have been naturally the man, I should think, to have been counsel there. Why was it, do you know?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I would not say that exactly, Senator. You see, there are certain unions of the American Federation of Labor that I represent, but I do not represent all of those unions at one time. There are certain very conservative locals that would not employ me. This organization is quite a conservative organization that is actually in control of the steel situation, and they would not employ me because they would want to avoid any impression getting about that they were in any way radical. So that is the reason, I assume, that if they were going to employ me, that that is the reason I was not employed.

The CHAIRMAN. Because you were too radical?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That they did not want to in any way be connected with anybody that was radical.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think that is the real reason why you were not employed?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Now, Senator, I do not know the reasons, and I just give you my reasons, so far as I can gather. There may be a very much better reason—that they did not think I was capable of handling the thing.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you expect them to employ you?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think that could have been the reason.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I say that may be, but I do not know.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you expect them to employ you?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You have said that you talked to Mr. Foster considerably about boring from within, and other witnesses have done that before us. You know the publication *Solidarity*? That was the I. W. W. publication?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Mr. Foster at one time editor of that?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I think he was a contributor, but I do not think he was an editor.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a candidate for editor?

Mr. MARGOLIS. He was a candidate, but I do not think he was ever an editor.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to read you a little from "*Solidarity*," which goes back to 1911. I think Mr. Foster had been across the sea and had returned.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (reading). "As to my candidacy" is the article. He says:

Is not this striking success of "boring from within" after continued failure of "building from without" tactics, which is but typical of the respective results being achieved everywhere by these tactics worthy of the most serious consideration on the part of the I. W. W.? Is it not time that we get off our knees from before this time-honored dual organization dogma and give it a thorough examination? And I'll promise—or threaten—that if I am elected editor the matter will get as thorough an investigation as lies in my power. The question, as important a one as the I. W. W. has ever been called upon to decide, is an extensive one, and in this short letter I have only been able to hint at it. It must be given a full and free discussion.

And then again:

I am satisfied from my observations that the only way for the I. W. W. to have the workers adopt and practice the principles of revolutionary unionism—

which I take is its mission—is to give up its attempt to create a new labor movement, turn itself into a propaganda league, get into the organized-labor movement, and by building up better fighting machines within the old unions than those possessed by our reactionary enemies, revolutionize these unions, even as our French syndicalist fellow workers have so successfully done with theirs.

Yours, for the revolution,

WM. Z. FOSTER.

I suppose you read those articles at the time?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I may have read it.

The CHAIRMAN. But this idea of boring from within seems to come from these articles——

Mr. MARGOLIS (interposing). He got the idea in France and in Italy.

The CHAIRMAN. And he has that idea still, hasn't he?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Now, he may still have it, but he does not say so.

Senator McKELLAR. He may still have it in the back of his head?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember the time when he was a delegate to the Budapest convention?

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is when he was in Europe. He was really not a delegate.

The CHAIRMAN. He tried to be a delegate against Mr. Duncan?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever examine Mr. Duncan's report in the proceedings of the American Federation of Labor of Mr. Foster's activities there?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No; I never did.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me call your attention to a little inside history, on page 149 of this report. Mr. Duncan said:

During the discussion on the motion, misguided Foster lost control of his temper and gave the convention ocular demonstration of what an I. W. W. really is. His language was foul, vulgar, and vehement. He even threatened assault, and subsided only to present expulsion from the room. He spoke in English, and I had his language interpreted to the delegates, but his actions were equally detrimental to the purpose he had in mind as was the interpretation. The Frenchmen were not dismayed at their tricolor being smudged with I. W. W. mire. They suggested that if the Foster aggregation were not admitted, that the American Federation of Labor should be kept out of the international secretariat until both organizations became reconciled to a uniform policy.

Were you interested in these matters at that time, back in 1911 and 1912?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes; and I was interested before.

The CHAIRMAN. Before that time?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, there is a great deal about that. Are you a member of this Syndicalist League of North America?

Mr. MARGOLIS. No. That is not in existence any more.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever a member?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I never was.

The CHAIRMAN. You knew about it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose you indorsed a good many things in it?

Mr. MARGOLIS. I can not recall now. I probably did.

Senator McKELLAR. All that made for an anarchism you indorsed, I suppose.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I suppose so.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you have enough knowledge of this to be able to say whether or not it really amounted to an organization?

Mr. MARGOLIS. The Syndicalist League?

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. MARGOLIS. It never amounted to anything.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is nothing else from Mr. Margolis, we are very much obliged to you for coming without a formal subpoena.

Mr. MARGOLIS. There is nothing to be obliged for. You asked me to come, and I came.

The CHAIRMAN. We can still be obliged to you, and we are obliged to you for your frankness.

Senator PHIPPS. Even if we can not agree with your on your conclusions.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Well, I did not expect that you would.

(Whereupon, at 1.10 o'clock p. m., an adjournment was taken, subject to the call of the chairman.)





# INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to the call of the chairman, at 10 o'clock a. m., at room 201, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon, presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Phipps, and McKellar.

Also present: J. Edward Ashmead, Newark, N. J., attorney for the United States Steel Corporation.

Lieut. Douald C. Van Buren, of the Intelligence Office, United States Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we will now proceed.

I have a letter here that I want to put into the record. It is a letter from the Governor of Pennsylvania. It is rather extended, but he wants it in, and I think it may go in.

Senator PHIPPS. I think that it should go in, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be inserted in the record at this point.

(The letter above referred to is here printed in the record in full, as follows:)

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
*Harrisburg, October 15, 1919.*

HON. WILLIAM S. KENYON,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KENYON: As a matter of fairness to our State police, and in order that a record may be kept in these matters, I am sending you herewith copies of certain documents, which I certify to be correct copies thereof, and which bear directly upon the investigations of strike conditions which you have been making at Pittsburgh.

As most of the charges made against the State police have been made by people who have come here from other States for the purpose of fomenting industrial unrest, and these documents are from the officials and citizens of our Commonwealth, I shall ask you, please, to make them a part of the official record of your committee.

I congratulate you upon the suggestions you have made regarding the Americanization of our foreign-born citizens. Here in Pennsylvania almost 20 per cent of the immigrants to this country stop for a time at least, and our problems are, therefore, very great. I beg to assure you that Pennsylvania will be very glad to cooperate with the Federal Government in any reasonable plan for teaching these aliens something of our language, our governmental principles, and our institutions. We are doing what we can in this direction now, but we realize that it is only a part of what should be done.

These documents include letters from the burgess of Farrell; letter from Hon. Benjamin Jarrett, former senator; letter from the mayor of McKeesport; letter from the burgess of Donora; petitions from the citizens of Donora; messages from the citizens of McKeesport; and statement from the department of State police.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM C. SPROUL,  
*Governor of Pennsylvania.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE,  
*Harrisburg, Pa., October 18, 1919.*

HON. WILLIAM C. SPROUL,  
*Governor of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.*

DEAR GOV. SPROUL: You recently referred to my office a copy of a letter written by the Rev. Kazenka, of Braddock, and addressed to W. Z. Foster, charging gross misconduct and abuse of authority on the part of members of the State police at Braddock, Pa.

I inclose herewith a complete report of this investigation from Capt. Mair, accompanied by the statements of Pmts. Keifer and McAndrew, the two officers who were present on this occasion, and statements of Leonard Jaxovwitz, S. J. Blderman, and Mrs. Jennie Moran, who were eyewitnesses.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE F. LUMB,  
*Acting Superintendent.*

PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, TROOP A.  
*Greensburg, Pa., October 11, 1919.*

THE SUPERINTENDENT,  
*Department of State Police, Harrisburg, Pa.*

SIR: I have the honor to report herein the result of my investigation of the charges of the Rev. A. Kazenka, of 416 Frazier Street, Braddock Pa., relative to the alleged misconduct of State policemen while on duty at Braddock, Pa., during September 22 and 23, 1919.

Statements from several citizens are hereto attached, which plainly show that the State police did not exceed their authority, and that the Rev. Mr. Kazenka has no grounds for any specific complaint, but has indulged in vague, general charges. The two policemen to whom Father Kazenka directs his attack in regard to the matter of interfering with men who had attended divine service, are: Pvt. Joseph M. Keifer, of Troop A, State police, enlisted November 1, 1918. Pvt. Eugene B. McAndrew, of Troop A, State police, enlisted February 1, 1919.

On the morning of September 22, 1919, which was the day of the beginning of the strike, Corpl. Nelson W. Smith, of Troop A, State police, who was in command of the substation at Braddock, Pa., ordered the two State policemen, as mentioned above, to patrol a certain district of Braddock, with orders to move all persons who were gathered in crowds on or near the public highways of the borough. I wish to call attention to the fact that the sheriff of Allegheny County, in which Braddock is situated, asked to have a detail of State police at that particular borough, as it was feared that there would be trouble there. Through careful investigation I find that one of the chief reasons for this supposition was due to the fact that the Rev. A. Kazenka, pastor of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church, was greatly in favor of the strike and had openly championed its cause, and his attitude has been more of a strike organizer than that of a pastor.

I have been informed that Father Kazenka's parish embraces approximately 1,500 of the strikers in and about Braddock, and that they are mostly all Slavish. On the morning of September 22, 1919, a mission was in progress in Father Kazenka's church, which is situated near the corner of Braddock Avenue and Eleventh Street, Braddock; services commenced at 9 a. m., and shortly after the services were over, which was about 10 a. m., Pmts. Keifer and McAndrew rode down the street and noticed crowds of men congregated on both sides of Braddock Avenue, making no effort to separate.

The two State policemen started to move the crowd, which extended on both sides of Braddock Avenue, a block each way from the church; and, after having the situation well in hand, everyone practically moving along in a normal manner, and when they were directly in front of the church two priests came out from the church property and approached Pvt. Keifer, who was nearest to them, and complained that the State police had no right to interfere with their religious service. Pvt. Keifer remarked to them that he had not known that services had been in progress and besides that this was a time of strike and that the men who had been moved were in the strike zone and were not either going or coming from church, as they were assembled in crowds on the public highway. He then rode away from the church and continued his patrol.

From a thorough investigation, I do not find that the State police interfered in any manner with the service in Father Kazenka's church, nor did they use

any abusive language or inflict any injury upon the priests whatsoever; that they did not use their batons nor draw them from the holsters or make any attempt to use force on the crowd, and I can not find that anyone suffered any physical injury through the performance of this duty. I believe that, notwithstanding the fact that these men had been to church that morning, that if they had been allowed to remain in groups upon the streets of Braddock that morning, that trouble might have resulted, as there were no women or children among them.

Relative to the statement of Father Kazenka in his letter to W. Z. Foster, under date of September 27, 1919, in which he states that the State police rode into some school children on the afternoon of September 22, 1919, I believe that this was occasioned by the fact that Corpl. Nelson W. Smith and Pvt. John T. Tomek arrested a foreigner for having firearms in his possession, and while the State policemen had the prisoner before a squire some school children gathered around the horses which were tied outside the squire's office, and the policemen, seeing that the children were in danger of being kicked, chased them away just previous to their mounting their horses and leaving the vicinity.

It is extremely difficult to run down all these little incidents, as in most cases the reports of the alleged misconduct of the State police are not based on the truth.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM E. MAIR,  
*Captain, State Police, Commanding Troop A.*

GREENSBURG, PA., October 10, 1919.

The COMMANDING OFFICER,  
*Troop A, State Police, Greensburg, Pa.*

SIR: I have the honor to respectfully submit the following report of duty performed by Pvt. Keifer, in company with Pvt. McAndrew, while on special mounted patrol, September 22, 1919:

Having been ordered by Corpl. Smith to patrol the streets of Braddock, Pa., for the purposes of dispersing crowds and maintaining order, about 1 a. m. he noticed approximately 2,000 men on Braddock Avenue, between Ninth and Thirteenth Streets. These men were not moving along, but were standing in groups, thus blockading the sidewalks, as well as disobeying the proclamation of the sheriff of Allegheny County to the effect that crowds were not permitted to congregate on the streets. I, together with Pvt. McAndrew, ordered these men to move along, which command did not necessitate the using of any force; in fact, neither myself nor Pvt. McAndrew drew our batons from our holsters. While ordering the crowd which had congregated in front of St. Michael's Church (Roman Catholic) at Braddock Avenue and Eleventh Street, to move along, two priests came out from the church property into the street.

From one of the priest's actions, he appeared to be very much excited, in view of the fact that he was waving his arms, thus attracting a great deal of attention. This priest, in a very angry mood, walked up to me and said, "What are you doing here?" I replied, "According to the proclamation issued by the sheriff of Allegheny County, crowds are not permitted to assemble in this street, it being within the strike zone; therefore, we are compelling the crowd to move on." The priest said, "These men have just left the church." We had been in the vicinity upwards of about 20 minutes moving the crowds along the street, who were, as stated above, blocking the sidewalks, and did not order anyone to move on who was already in motion or actually on the church property. It was evident from the number of men congregated on the sidewalks, even though they had been to church that morning, had no intention of going to their homes quietly, but, as stated above in my report, were ganged upon the sidewalks. Pvt. McAndrew and myself only stayed long enough in the vicinity of the church that we might hear what the priest had to say.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH M. KEIFER,  
*Private, Troop A, State Police.*

BRADDOCK, PA., October 9, 1919.

COMMANDING OFFICER,  
*Troop A, State Police, Braddock, Pa.*

SIR: I have the honor to submit the following report of duty performed by myself, in company with Pvt. Keifer, while on special mounted patrol:

Having been ordered by Corpl. Smith to patrol the streets of Braddock, Pa., disperse crowds, about 10 a. m. we noticed probably 2,000 men on Braddock Avenue, between Ninth and Thirteenth Streets. These men were not moving along, but were standing in groups and were disobeying the proclamation of the sheriff of Allegheny County, to the effect that they were not allowed to congregate on the streets in gangs. I, together with Pvt. Keifer, ordered these men to move along. It was not necessary to use any force whatsoever. Neither myself nor Pvt. Keifer drew our batons from our holsters. While ordering the crowd to move, and when in front of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church, at Braddock Avenue and Eleventh Street, two priests came out from the church property into the street and approached Pvt. Keifer, who was nearer to them than I, and from one of the priest's actions he appeared to be very much excited, as he was waving his arms and attracting a great deal of attention. I did not hear what was said, but Pvt. Keifer immediately joined me and told me that the Polish priest was very angry because we had moved the men, and said that these men had just left church. We had been in the vicinity upwards of about 20 minutes moving the crowds along the street, who were, as stated above, blocking the sidewalks, and did not order anyone to move on who was already in motion or actually on the church property. It was evident from the number of men congregated on the sidewalks, even though they had been to church, had no intention of going to their homes quietly, but, as stated above in my report, were ganged up on the sidewalks. Neither myself nor Pvt. Keifer stayed longer in the vicinity of the church than was necessary.

Very respectfully,

EUGENE B. McANDREW.

---

STATEMENT OF MR. LEONARD JACOBWITZ 1034 BRADDOCK AVENUE, BRADDOCK, PA.

I, Leonard Jacobwitz, proprietor of a drug store at 1034 Braddock Avenue, Braddock, Pa., noticed two State policemen dispersing a crowd that had assembled on the sidewalks in the vicinity of my store about 10 a. m. September 22, 1919. My store is directly opposite and facing St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church. I saw two State policemen first going down the street ordering people to move on; then about 10 or 20 minutes afterwards they returned and started to move those who had not obeyed them when they first rode up. There were many men crowded on the sidewalks on both sides of the street. I saw the State policemen order many of the foreigners crowded in front and near my store to move, but I did not see anyone struck, nor did the State policemen when I saw them have their clubs in their hands or any other weapon. When the State policemen were directly in front of the church the second time, I saw two priests come out and speak to them. I did not hear what was said, but shortly afterwards the State policemen rode away. The crowd had dispersed by this time. In my opinion the incident did not amount to very much, as there was no great excitement, no blows struck, or, as far as I could learn, anyone injured.

---

This statement was obtained from Mr. Leonard Jacobwitz, of 1034 Braddock Avenue, Braddock, Pa., on October 9, 1919, by Capt. William E. Mulr, Troop A, State police, in the presence of Pvt. Ralph A. Stephens, of Troop A, State police.

Mr. Jacobwitz, on account of being in business and dealing to a great extent with the men who are on strike, would not consent to make an affidavit, but willingly gave the above information.

STATEMENT OF MR. S. J. BIEDERMAN, 1028 BRADDOCK AVENUE, BRADDOCK, PA.

I, S. J. Biederman, proprietor of a gent's furnishing store at No. 1028 Braddock, Pa., and speaking nearly all the foreign languages, do state that my place of business is almost directly opposite the St. Michael's Roman Catholic

Church (Slavish Church); that a few days after the affair at the Slavish Church a foreigner came into my office—his name and identity I can not recall, as nearly all of my business is with that class of people. This foreigner started to talk about the affair and the actions of the State police and that of the rectors on September 2, 1919, he saying that after the church was out, about 10 minutes or so the State police came and gave us orders to clear the sidewalks, and not to gather, and to move on, and keep moving, which we did, and one of the men went into the church and told Father Kazenka, who is our rector, and he came out and started to talk to the police, and they told him that they had orders not to allow any congregating on the sidewalks, and that these orders must be carried out. And they left him. This made him rave. He also told me that there was no violence used by the State police, in moving the foreigners, and they moved quickly, nor did the State police use their clubs or guns, and that they did not interfere with the divine church services and were not on the church steps.

---

This statement was obtained from S. J. Blederman, at Braddock, Pa., on October 9, 1919, by Sergt. J. L. Fressel, Troop A, State police, in the presence of Capt. Dalley, of Braddock, Pa.

Mr. Blederman, on account of being in business and dealing to a great extent with men who are on strike, would not consent to make affidavit, but willingly gave the above information.

---

STATEMENT OF MRS. JENNIE MORAN, 1030 BRADDOCK AVENUE, BRADDOCK, PA.

I, Mrs. Jennie Moran, do state that about 9 a. m., September 22, 1919, while in my grocery store, together with Hilda Johnson, who is my clerk, which is directly in front and across the street from St. Michael's Church, of which Rev. A. Kazenka is rector, I observed that the church was out at least 10 minutes, and I saw the mounted State police asking the men to move on in a quiet and orderly manner, which they did. I saw one trooper on the sidewalk near the church; he was also asking the men to move on. I did not see the rector and the other priest come out of their church, but I saw them on the outside, and the Rev. Kazenka, who was raising his hands and was what I call furious, and the trooper said something and moved away. There were no clubs used or drawn; the troopers did not use any violence and the church goers were given ample time to disperse and were in no way interfered with in their worship nor services. I am more than glad to know that the business people are getting protection, as I am a widow with two children, and also a member of the St. Thomas Catholic Church, of this town. I did not see any trooper on the church step nor on the lawns.

Miss Hilda Johnson, a clerk in Mrs. Moran's store, substantiated Mrs. Moran's statement, these two women being together when the supposed trouble took place.

---

This statement was obtained from Mrs. Jennie Moran and Miss Hilda Johnson, at Braddock, Pa., October 9, 1919, by Sergt. J. L. Tressel, of Troop A, State police, in the presence of Capt. Dalley, of Braddock, Pa.

Mrs. Moran on account of being in business and dealing to a great extent with men who are on strike, and Miss Hilda Johnson, due to the fact that she is employed as a clerk in Mrs. Moran's store, would not consent to make affidavit, but willingly gave the above information.

---

BOROUGH OF FARRELL,  
Farrell, Pa., October 6, 1919.

Gov. WILLIAM SPROUL,  
Harrisburg, Pa.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I regard it my plain duty to write to you and tell you of my personal appreciation of your prompt response to my call for help against frenzied radicals in the time of the present riots. It also appears proper for me, as executive of our town, to express the thanks of all of our good citizens for your timely service in their behalf.

Gov. Sproul, these mere expressions of appreciation will not give you the explanation you deserve. The prompt and efficient service of the officers assigned to duty here certainly saved many lives and millions of dollars by preventing destruction of property. In my first message to you I had endeavored to indicate that we had no way of knowing what chaos would be by midnight. Even now I feel free to say we had every evidence that conditions would have baffled description.

When I tell you I am truly thankful to you for your interest in our welfare in this matter I am sure the business men and all good citizens of this valley will agree with me and join me in such expression. I must also extend to your officers, through you, our thanks for the very thorough and constant application of their strength to the work assigned them. Like so many soldiers they stood guard over our lives and our fortunes. At the time they did this they faced conditions which would have brought cowards to the feet of Bolshevikism and made of them nothing but cringing suppliants. In the sincere wish that such requests may not have to be repeated.

I beg to remain, your grateful friend,

J. H. MOODY, *Burgess.*

FERRELL, PA., October 10, 1919.

HON. WILLIAM A. SPROUL,  
*Harrisburg, Pa.*

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I have been intending to write you for some time to thank you for your promptness in taking care of us at Farrell when we called on you for assistance.

I am sure that it was your promptness in getting the State police here at Farrell that saved many lives and many thousand dollars' worth of property.

I do not know whether you recall it or not, but when I was in the senate I voted against every bill in favor of the State constabulary, but from what I saw here at Farrell before the arrival of the State police and what I saw upon the arrival and since—that is, their well-trained, brave, and effective discharge of duties—have certainly convinced me that I have had the wrong ideas about the State constabulary.

It is true that they are stern in enforcing their orders. One may be offended at their sternness, but that is what is required, "Sternness," and we must pass up our own personal feelings for the great good that they are doing in the community.

I wish, also, through you to extend our hearty thanks to Mr. McDevitt. He certainly was patient, kind, and courteous through our trouble. It makes one feel good to know that such men are at the head of the affairs of our State.

I feel that what I say here is expressing the real sentiment of all of the law-abiding citizens of this community.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours, very respectfully,

BENJ. JARRETT.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
*Borough of Farrell, County of Mercer, ss:*

Personally appeared before me the undersigned, a notary public in and for said county and State, Henry Moody, who being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the burgess of Farrell, Mercer County, Pennsylvania, that he has been in charge of the police force as said burgess during the whole of the period since the strike commenced at the United States Steel Corporation plants in said borough; that Carl McCartney, during the said period, was chief of police of said borough, and as such was delegated to control the peace and good order in the vicinity; that your affiant has read and is acquainted with all the facts set forth in the affidavit made by Carl McCartney, covering the activities of the police officers during said period, with special relation to the connection with the Pennsylvania State police and their part in the unfortunate trouble which occurred during this period. That it concurs entirely in the affidavit of the said Carl McCartney and that all facts stated therein are absolutely true.

That as an especial privilege in this affidavit your affiant wishes to state that through the efficient work of the State police in cooperation with the borough and county authorities the deplorable situation was cared for and the condition which might have eventuated in the loss of very great property

rights, as well as very many lives, was in a great measure, though not entirely, avoided. The State police were brought to Farrell at the suggestion of the borough and county authorities to care for a situation which had gotten beyond the control of said authorities. Their efforts during the time of their presence in the midst of a most trying situation were extremely commendable and were very greatly appreciated by all the good citizens of Mercer County.

J. H. MOODY.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, A. D., 1919.

[SEAL.]

JAMES NEVANT, *Notary Public.*

My commission expires April 1, 1923.

DONORA, PA., October 8, 1919.

To his honor, WILLIAM C. SPROUL,  
*Harrisburg, Pa.*

DEAR SIR: The undersigned, burgess of Donora, Washington County, Pa., feels that it is necessary for the protection of the lives and property of the citizens of this borough that more of the State police be stationed in the borough. There are a number of men, heretofore employed in the mills, who are desirous of returning to work, but are afraid to do so, because of the threats of the strikers. If adequate protection were given them, they would return to work at once.

Their fears are not without foundation. Several men have already been attacked on their way to and from work, and a number of strikers have been arrested and fined and otherwise sentenced in connection with this incident.

At present, we have a police force of 10 men. There are 6 members of the State police stationed here and about 9 deputy sheriffs. The strikers have no respect for nor fear of the police force nor the deputies. The only persons who seem to be able to handle them efficiently and properly and to protect the town from them are the State police.

Yesterday, Mother Jones gave a radical talk in an adjoining town, Charlecot Borough, and the result of her speech is being felt in our town to-day. The strikers are gathering on the streets in larger crowds, to-day, and are more bold in their declarations of what will happen if their demands are not speedily adjusted.

The population of the town is approximately 85 per cent foreign, and a large number of such foreigners are of the radical—so-called Bolshevik element. The sergeant of the State police force now in town, agrees with the writer that he should have at least four more of the members of the State police, if not more, in addition to those now in the town.

The mill buildings are located on the river front and cover a stretch of approximately 3 miles. There are four principal entrances to these mills which are of necessity quite a distance apart, and for that reason the State Constabulary must divide into pairs in their work and on occasion must act individually. The writer does not feel that this is either fair to the State police nor to the public.

The State police who are stationed here are doing everything in their power and all that could be expected of them to handle the situation. The purpose of this letter is to obtain additional State police as promptly as possible, and along that line, the writer might say that he has this day held consultation with a number of the borough officials and representative citizens of the town, and from the feeling in the air it is their honest and sincere judgment that a serious outbreak is imminent and that unless more of the State constabulary are stationed here the writer and citizens feel that riots and street fighting, with almost certain loss of life and destruction of property, are sure to follow. They may follow anyhow but it is believed that the only antidote is on increased force of State police.

We trust that your honor will give this letter your serious consideration, and that you will act favorably thereon.

Very, truly yours,

HARRY A. COX,  
*Burgess of Donora.*

*To his honor the governor of the State of Pennsylvania:*

The petition of the undersigned citizens of Donora, Pa., respectfully represents—

1. That their town of 15,000 people, is from 70 to 85 per cent foreign. Since the inauguration of the steel strike on September 22, 1919, there have been several parades of the foreign element through the town, one of which was estimated to have contained at least 3,000 persons.

2. That a great number of foreigners are armed. There have been several clashes between the authorities and these foreigners, none of which have resulted fatally.

3. That the sheriff of Washington County has been called upon by the local authorities to give protection to the town. So far there are but five deputies stationed in the town. The local police force consists of but 6 regular officers, which force has been augmented by 30 citizen volunteers.

4. There is a great potential danger of an outbreak at any time, and the authorities feel that they are, and in the belief of your petitioners, are unable to cope with any serious situation which may arise.

5. That the foreign element have a wholesome respect for the State constabulary. Your petitioners believe there is an imperative necessity for the maintenance of an armed force in the town to supplement the efforts of the officers now stationed here.

They, therefore, respectfully pray your honor, that he will dispatch to this town, and station here during the course of this strike a troop of State police, that the lives and property of the citizens of the town may be preserved.

And they will ever pray,

Carl F. Gass, lumber dealer, 609 Meldon Avenue; C. B. Charles, jeweler, 656 McKean; Gustav Schaefer, assessor, 645 Thompson Avenue; W. H. Lewis, physician, Thompson and Fifth; K. E. Miller, assistant superintendent, 568 McKean Avenue; W. I. Drink, foreman, 726 Walnut Street; J. W. Buler, foreman, 131 Thompson Avenue; P. A. Burkhardt, chief clerk, Tenth and Helsep Avenue; G. I. Montgomery, assistant chief clerk, 830 Thompson Avenue; L. R. Dieterich, clerk, 84 Thompson Avenue; R. R. Furlong, shipping clerk, Donora; J. George Johnson, clerk, 129 Ida Avenue; Norman Hormell, clerk, 129 Ida Avenue; W. G. Haskell, clerk, 804 Walnut Street; Frank A. Adler, clerk, 209 Madisette; Glenn H. Crossland, clerk, 304 Tenth Street; M. M. Neale, engineer, 913 McKean Avenue; B. L. Raynal, foreman, 206 Second Street; R. R. Riddle, deputy inspector, Bank of Donora (Apartments); Chas. O. Achison, foreman, 207 Walnut Street; J. W. Gelb, superintendent, Irondale Hotel; Michael McDonough, captain of police, 973 McKean Avenue; C. L., foreman, 836 McKean Avenue; James Dailey, watchman, 723 McKean Avenue; R. S. McMahon, clerk, Donora; Edward Stier, watchman, 432 Second Street; A. F. Coughenour, 567 McKean Avenue; C. J. Brennan, 973 McKean Avenue; G. H. Berg, foreman, 745 Meldon Avenue; F. C. Kline, 109 Ninth Street; O. A. Roley, watchman, 528 Thompson Avenue; Lloyd Haywood, Donora; Albert Eisenberg, 562 McKean Avenue; Jasper Wichor, foreman, 12 McKean Avenue; O. A. Roley, Jr., clerk, 528 Thompson Avenue; I. J. Pyzka, 1037 McKean Avenue; F. J. Pyzka, 1167 Meldon Avenue; J. B. Anneman, 105 Meldon Avenue; S. L. Brown, 562 Thompson Avenue; Leonard Nahar, watchman, Donora; Thomas Smith, watchman, Donora; T. C. O'Connell, chemical engineer, Donora; Aug. Mann, 300 Highland Avenue; J. B. Clark, 1312 Meldon Avenue; Wm. J. Googin, 673 McKean Avenue; J. F. Morton, 423 Murray Avenue; George Tucker, lumber dealer, 153 Thompson Avenue; J. Wm. Carothers, jeweler, West Newton; I. F. Grant, assessor, 339 First Street; W. O. Brinham, physician, 86 Kenrie Avenue; James Crain, assistant superintendent, 506 Allen Avenue; B. F. Gallatin, foreman, 327 Fifth Avenue; P. J. Jeffers, foreman, 116 Eleventh Street; Harry W. Govier, chief clerk, 612 Thompson Avenue; Phil J. Roney, assistant chief clerk, 115 Bertha Street; J. O. Lenhart, clerk, Union Trust Building; William McNamee, shipping clerk, 75 Castner Avenue; Louis J. Altenhof, clerk, Carol Township; R. Lang-



staff, clerk, 409 Prospect Avenue; T. E. Gage, clerk, 791 Thompson Avenue; C. J. Brown, clerk, 1322 Meldon Avenue; H. D. Braunmeller, clerk, Union Trust Building; Harry D. Teeter, engineer, Union Trust Building; Thea Davis, deputy inspector, 987 Thompson Avenue; S. Coughenorer, 625 Fifth Street; Frank Ginsinger, 65 Castner Avenue; John H. Hastings, 133 Ida Avenue; Gilbert E. Lester, assistant foreman, 418 McKean Avenue; Paul T. Boyd, Donora; John Gamble, 120 Eleventh Street; S. E. Allen, Spragg Building; Daniel J. Donnar, Donora; Philip Sweeney, 724 McKean Avenue; D. J. Connerley, 986 Thompson Avenue; Joseph Schmitt, 438 Eighth Street; Thomas Jordon, 60 Allen Avenue; August Totzy, 1324 Meldon Avenue; Fred Seed-erly, 709 Chestnut; G. W. Gallatin, 678 McKean Avenue; M. H. O'Donnell, 636 Walnut Street; Charles H. McKenney, 134 Castner Avenue; Joseph Wies, 400 McKean Avenue; Joseph T. Boyd, McKean Avenue; J. F. Delaney, 116 Eleventh Street; Roderick R. Hastee, Donora; P. J. Hillcutten, 319 Third Street; Antonio Costa, 964 Thompson Avenue; George Fehneth, 740 Thompson Avenue; Charles C. Carbaugh, 133 Bertha Avenue; P. J. Langworthy, Koehler Avenue; Pat Payton, 114 Eleventh Street; M. S. Robinson, 827 Thompson Avenue; Apel Carlson, 759 Meldon Avenue; John McLeaber, 105 First Street; Martin Connolly, Donora; Ben Harshman, Donora, Fifth Street; George B. Roberts, 858 Thompson Avenue; Edward Gondeck, 145 Madisette; Thomas R. Mahoney, 310 Tenth Street; John Francis, 110 Ida Avenue; W. E. O'Donnell, 121 Madesette Avenue; John Hausler, 447 McKean Avenue; John Calderhead, 1015 McKean Avenue; T. J. Peterson.

To his honor the GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA:

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the borough of Donora, Pa., respectfully represents:

First. That their town of 15,000 people is from 75 per cent to 85 per cent foreign. Since the inauguration of the steel strike on September 22, 1919, there have been several parades of the foreign element through the town, one of which was estimated to have contained at least 3,000 persons.

Second. That a great number of the foreigners are armed and there have been several clashes between the authorities and these foreigners, none of which have resulted fatally.

Thirld. That the sheriff of Washington County has been called upon by the local authorities to give protection to the town. So far there are but five deputies stationed in the town. The local police force consists of but 6 regular officers, which force has been augmented by 30 citizens, volunteers.

Fourth. That there is great potential danger of an outbreak at any time, and the authorities feel that they are, and in the belief of your petitioners are, unable to keep down any serious situation which may arise.

Fifth. That the foreign element have a wholesome respect for the State constabulary. Your petitioners believe there is an imperative necessity for the maintenance of an armed force in the town to supplement the efforts of the officers now stationed here.

They therefore respectfully pray your honor that he will dispatch to this town and station here during the course of this strike a troop of State police, that the lives and property of the citizens of the town may be preserved.

And they will every pray.

W. J. Brown, jeweler, Donner Avenue; D. W. Gallatin; Will H. Watson, editor, Fifth Street; R. H. Ridgely, automobile dealer; W. J. Byers, electrician; G. H. Zender, foreman; Harold Capen, foreman; Rufus Bailes, foreman; Elmer F. Shumaker, foreman; J. B. White, foreman; C. T. Lewis, real estate agent; H. Charles Ford, justice of the peace; S. S. Kelly, merchant; J. P. Castner, president Union Trust Co. of Donora; Thomas M. Gilland, superintendent of schools; Albert J. Vernon, postmaster; H. B. Wilcox, millworker; G. E. Kredil, member borough council.

To his honor the GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA :

The petition of the undersigned citizens of Donora, Pa., respectfully represents :

First. That their town of 15,000 is from 70 per cent to 85 per cent foreign. Since the inauguration of the steel strike on September 22, 1919, there have been several parades of the foreign element through the town, one of which was estimated to have contained at least 3,000 persons.

Second. That a great number of the foreigners are armed. There have been several clashes between the authorities and these foreigners, none of which have resulted fatally.

Third. That the sheriff of Washington County has been called upon by the local authorities to give protection to the town. So far there are but five deputies stationed in the town. The local police force consists of but 6 regular officers, which force has been augmented by 30 citizen volunteers.

Fourth. That there is great potential danger of an outbreak at any time, and the authorities feel that they are, and the belief of your petitioners are, unable to keep down any serious situation which may arise.

Fifth. That the foreign element have a wholesome respect for the State constabulary. Your petitioners believe there is an imperative necessity for the maintenance of an armed force in the town to supplement the efforts of the officers now stationed here.

They therefore respectfully pray your honor that he will dispatch to this town and station here during the course of this strike a troop of State police, that the lives and property of the citizens of the town may be preserved.

And they will ever pray.

S. L. Mills, pastor Methodist Episcopal Church ; Henry E. Vincent, electrician ; C. R. Carson, clerk ; Minor H. Day, physician ; R. E. Koehler, real estate agent ; J. D. Fellenhum, foreman ; C. F. Crumrise, foreman ; Nathan Machtel, merchant ; Larry E. McKenzie, newspaper editor ; Grover W. Boyd, justice of the peace ; J. A. Aprowls, physician ; W. W. Schnipp, merchant ; C. L. Foreman, merchant ; A. J. Delaney, foreman ; Ben G. Binns, bank cashier ; M. M. Donnelley, mill worker ; Mose Miller, merchant ; E. D. Morse, merchant ; John E. Chadwick, foreman Duplex ; A. G. Bussman, chemist ; O. T. Kelly, dentist.

#### COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,

*City of McKeesport, County of Allegheny, ss :*

Before me, the undersigned authority, appeared George H. Lysle, who, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the mayor of the city of McKeesport, Pa., and that he has been mayor of said city of McKeesport since December, 1913.

That located within the limits of McKeesport are large plants of the United States Steel Corporation, the Firth-Sterling Steel Co., the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co., and that immediately across the river and adjacent to the city is now located the plant of the McKeesport Tin Plate Co.

That on September 2, 1919, a crowd assembled in the city of McKeesport, numbering about 4,000, and proceeded to the police station of the city of McKeesport and threatened to destroy said police station. From the police station the mob was led to the gates of the National Tube Co. That threats were made against both the employees and the property of the company and a general riotous condition resulted. That at the present time a strike exists in the city of McKeesport, which strike was called on September 22, 1919. That since the date of the calling of this strike several attempts have been made to hold unlawful assemblages in violation of the proclamation of the high sheriff of Allegheny County. That conditions existing in the city of McKeesport at the present time are of a highly dangerous nature, and which may at any time again flame forth and result in riot, bloodshed, and murder being committed. That the number of persons who participated in these attempted unlawful assemblages were such and the temper of the persons engaged in these demonstrations were such that I am of the opinion that it would be absolutely impossible for the police force of the city of McKeesport to adequately cope with the situation. That peace and good order has been maintained within the limits of the city of McKeesport ; this has been due largely to the presence here of a detachment of the State constabulary of the State of Pennsylvania.

These men have been engaged only in the preservation of the peace and good order of this community, and they have performed their duty efficiently, courageously, and impartially. They have been most scrupulous and respectful of the rights of all law-abiding citizens, and no person or persons who went about their business in an orderly manner were in any way, shape, or form molested. I am further satisfied that the preservation of peace and good order absolutely demands the retention of the State constabulary here until such time as conditions change. That I am entirely satisfied and convinced that the withdrawal of the State constabulary from this district at this time would result in riot breaking forth within a very short time and in such proportion that the local police force would be absolutely inadequate and unable to handle the situation.

That conditions prior to the arrival of the detachment of State troops in this district were such that riot had already broken forth, and the preservation of peace and good order was practically beyond the control of the local police. That at the present time there is no disorder of any kind or nature whatsoever in the city, and that it is largely due to the presence of the State constabulary that peace and order has been maintained. That the withdrawal of the State constabulary at this time, I am satisfied, would result in the conditions existing prior to their arrival here.

Deponent further say that threatening letters were tacked upon the doors of workmen of the local mills, which said letters have been brought to the office of the mayor of McKeesport; that attached to and made part of this affidavit are copies of the letter, which were brought to the office of the mayor of McKeesport, Pa.

All of which is true and correct, as I verily believe.

GEORGE H. LYSLE,  
Mayor City of McKeesport, Pa.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

R. W. JUNKER, Notary Public.

My commission expires March 11, 1921.

---

1001 HIGH STREET:

If you want to live, so do not go to work; just stay home, and if you do go to work, so you better watch yourself, so then you will get a black eye, and you were not looking for it never in your whole life.

---

1125 GRANT STREET, UPSTAIRS; ONE ALSO DOWNSTAIRS:

If you want to live, so don't go to the work; just stay home; and if you do go to work you better watch yourself, so then you will get a black eye, and you were not looking for it.

---

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Allegheny*, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared James T. Reddington, who being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is chief of police of the city of McKeesport, Allegheny County, Pa., and has been chief of police of the city of McKeesport, Allegheny County, Pa., for a period of five years. That prior to the time he became chief of the police force of said city he was an officer on the police force of said city for a period of about 10 years.

That prior to the arrival of the detachment of State constabulary now located in the city of McKeesport, a serious condition of affairs existed in said city. This condition culminated in a riot, which broke forth on the evening of September 2, 1919. About 4,000 irresponsible persons formed themselves into a mob and proceeded to the police station of the city of McKeesport and there threatened to destroy the public property of the said city. From the police station the mob proceeded to the gates of the National Tube Co., and there injured employees and destroyed property of the said company. That the police force of the city of McKeesport was inadequate to cope with the riot of the proportion of the one which broke forth here on September 2, 1919, and that subsequent to the calling of the steel strike on September 22, 1919, irresponsible persons have again

attempted to hold unlawful gatherings in the city of McKeesport, contrary to the ordinances of said city and to the proclamation of the high sheriff of Allegheny County.

That the detachment of State constabulary now located in the city of McKeesport has been largely instrumental in maintaining the peace and good order of this community. That on September 24 a large crowd assembled upon the public streets of the city of McKeesport for the purpose of holding an unlawful gathering, and that the State constabulary was largely instrumental in maintaining the good order of the community at this time. That during the attempt of these persons to hold the aforesaid unlawful assemblage, an attempt was made to take the life of this deponent.

That the State constabulary have at all times since their arrival in this district performed their duties impartially and conscientiously and have apparently had in mind only the maintenance of the peace and good order of the community.

That your deponent has had many years of experience as a peace officer in the city of McKeesport and that as a result of this experience he is of the opinion that the best interests of this community demand that the police force of the city of McKeesport be assisted by the State constabulary of the State of Pennsylvania. The members of the State constabulary of the State of Pennsylvania have gone about their duty carefully and conscientiously and have at all times preserved the rights of all law-abiding citizens.

Your deponent is also of the opinion that the lives of the citizens and the safety of the property in this vicinity would be immediately in danger were the State troopers to be withdrawn from this city and that the best interests of the entire community demand that the State constabulary be maintained here until such time as the present existing condition becomes more peaceable. Conditions, at the present time, in this district are such that riot and bloodshed may break forth upon the slightest provocation and that if riot were to break forth the forces of the police department of the city of McKeesport and the sheriff of Allegheny County would be entirely inadequate to cope with the situation which would result.

That the retention of the State constabulary is absolutely necessary for the preservation of peace and good order and for the safety of the inhabitants of this community. All of which is true and correct as affiant verily believes.

JAMES T. REDDINGTON.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

R. W. JUNKER, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 11, 1919.

---

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Allegheny, ss:*

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Robert E. Stone, who, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is a citizen of the city of McKeesport and has lived in said city for the past 30 years. That he is engaged in the furniture business in said city and is property owner therein. That on September 22, 1919, a strike was called in the steel industry, which has large plants located within the limits of the city of McKeesport and in the borough of Portvue, immediately adjacent thereto. That prior to the time of the calling of the strike, to wit, September 2, 1919, a riot broke forth in the city of McKeesport, wherein a crowd of about 4,000 people collected upon the public highways of the city of McKeesport and proceeded to the police station of said city, and that thereafter the mob proceeded to the entrance of the National Tube works, located in said city, and there destroyed property and injured employees of the said company. That the situation resulting therefrom was of a very serious nature and one which crime of every kind might break forth at any minute. Your deponent is of the opinion that the situation was entirely beyond the control of the legally constituted police authorities of the city of McKeesport and of the deputies of the sheriff of Allegheny County.

That since the calling of the strike, on September 22, 1919, various attempts have been made to hold unlawful gatherings in violation of the proclamation of the sheriff of Allegheny County. That the condition existing prior to the arrival of the State constabulary in the city of McKeesport was one wherein the safety of the inhabitants of the city of McKeesport was greatly in danger, and that, as a business man of the said city, he is also of the opinion that the safety of property in the city of McKeesport was in danger. That since the

arrival of the State constabulary in the city of McKeesport peace and good order had been maintained, and this with due respect to the rights of all law-abiding citizens. That the State police have performed their duties in a conscientious and painstaking manner and have at all times thoroughly respected the rights of the law-abiding citizens of the city of McKeesport. He is of the opinion that were the State troops to be withdrawn from the city of McKeesport at the present time grave danger would immediately face the citizens of this city, and that property would immediately be exposed to the danger of destruction from uncontrollable crowds of irresponsible persons. He is of the opinion that the members of the State constabulary have conducted themselves as gentlemen and conscientious peace officers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and that their removal at the present time would very seriously jeopardize the best interests of this community.

All of which is correct as affiant verily believes.

ROBERT E. STONE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

R. W. JUNKER, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 11, 1921.

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Allegheny, ss:**

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared R. M. Baldridge, who being duly sworn according to law deposes and says that he is a citizen of the city of McKeesport, and has lived therein over 40 years, and that at the present time he is cashier of the Union National Bank in said city of McKeesport.

That he is of the opinion that the detachment of State constabulary now located in the city of McKeesport have performed their duties as peace officers of the State of Pennsylvania in a careful and impartial manner. That they have at all times respected the rights of all law-abiding citizens and have only attempted at all times to keep peace and good order in the community.

That a serious condition of affairs exists in this community owing to the steel strike, and that there has already been a riot in the city of McKeesport. Your deponent is of the opinion that the safety of the citizens and that their lives and property are very largely dependent upon the retention of the State constabulary in this district. Deponent is further of the opinion that in the event of riot the police force would be entirely inadequate to cope with the situation without the assistance of the State troops now here. All of which is true and correct as affiant verily believes.

R. M. BALDRIDGE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the 26th day of September, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

R. W. JUNKER, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 11, 1921.

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Allegheny, ss:**

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared E. W. Pitts, who being duly sworn according to law deposes and says that he is a resident and property owner of the city of McKeesport and at the present time is president of the Peoples Bank and the McKeesport Title & Trust Company in said city.

That at the present time a serious condition of affairs exists in the city of McKeesport by reason of the steel strike. That already there has been a riot in the city of McKeesport, and it has been clearly demonstrated that the local police force is not sufficient to cope with the situation.

That the State constabulary located here at the present time have performed their duties as peace officers of this Commonwealth in an able and conscientious manner and have at all times respected the rights and privileges of law-abiding citizens. The continuance of peace and good order in this community is, in the opinion of your deponent, very largely dependent upon the retention of the State constabulary in this district, and your deponent is further of the opinion that if the State constabulary were removed at this time, the rights of the citizens and their property would be in immediate jeopardy by reason of riots which might break out at any time. The State

constabulary has been the greatest single factor in the maintenance of order in this community and your deponent believes that their retention is absolutely necessary. All of which is true and correct as affiant verily believes.

E. W. PITTS.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. F. MORLOCK, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires February 19, 1921.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Allegheny, ss:*

Before me, the undersigned authority, appeared H. A. Davidson, who being duly sworn according to law deposes and says that he is the managing secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of McKeesport, County of Allegheny, State of Pennsylvania, and that he has occupied this position since March, 1917.

That the Chamber of Commerce of the City of McKeesport is an organization of about 400 business men of the city of McKeesport. That as the managing secretary of the Chamber of Commerce deponent is in a particularly advantageous position to know the sentiment existing among the business men in the city of McKeesport, Pa.

That a very serious condition of affairs exists in the city of McKeesport by reason of a strike among the steel workers called on September 22, 1919. That already in the city of McKeesport prior to the time the strike was actually called a riot broke out with which the local police were entirely unable to cope. In this riot property was destroyed, persons injured, and lives endangered.

Your deponent is of the opinion that the preservation of the peace and good order of this community is entirely dependent upon the retention of the detachment of State constabulary in this district from his observance and from the conversation which he has had with other citizens in the community, he is of the opinion that the members of the State constabulary have performed their duty as police officers of this community faithfully and impartially and that at no time have they in any way violated any of the rights of the law-abiding citizens of this community. He is of the opinion that the conditions still existing require the attention of the State troops in this district as an absolute necessity. At any time riot may break forth which may result in bloodshed and the endangering of lives and property of the citizens of the city of McKeesport. The Chamber of Commerce has taken action relative to backing up the regularly constituted police authorities of the city of McKeesport, but even with this additional force the situation would be entirely beyond the control of the local authorities were a riot to break forth, such as occurred in the city of McKeesport on September 2, 1919.

Your deponent, therefore, is of the opinion that it is the unanimous desire of the best citizens of the city of McKeesport that the State constabulary be retained until such times as conditions as they now exist become more nearly normal.

The troops here have been the most important factor in the maintenance of peace and good order and their removal at this time would very seriously jeopardize the welfare of this entire community.

All of which is true and correct, as I verily believe.

H. A. DAVIDSON,

*Managing Secretary, Chamber of Commerce, McKeesport, Pa.*

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 26th day of September, A. D. 1919.

R. W. JUNKER, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 11, 1921.

The CHAIRMAN. I have here some other affidavits from Pittsburgh about various matters and I will put these in the record, and also an affidavit that we secured from Mr. Brown's office in the Fanny Snelens case.

Senator PHIPPS. You want to put those in?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. I suggest that we put in the testimony taken at the coroner's inquest.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not that in?

Senator PHIPPS. No; only the findings of the coroner's jury, but not the testimony taken or the testimony of the men who afterwards conducted the autopsy to check up that testimony, and I think that should go in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it very extensive?

Senator PHIPPS. I do not think it will be. If you are going to put in that in full, I think that the testimony should go in.

(The testimony above referred to will be found at the conclusion of to-day's proceedings.)

The CHAIRMAN. We have asked for these affidavits and I think we had better put them in.

(The affidavits, together with all letters from J. G. Brown, are here printed in the record in full, as follows:)

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ORGANIZING IRON AND STEEL WORKERS,  
Pittsburgh, Pa., October 14, 1919.

HON. W. S. KENYON,  
Chairman Senate Committee on Education and Labor,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed please find affidavits bearing on the Fannie Snellens murder case, which we promised to furnish your committee.

Very respectfully, yours,

J. G. BROWN.

#### AFFIDAVIT.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
County of Allegheny, ss:

Personally, before me, the undersigned authority, appeared William Nolan, M. D., of New Kensington, Westmoreland County and State of Pennsylvania, and George L. Krieger, M. D., of New Kensington, Westmoreland County and State of Pennsylvania, who, both upon being duly sworn according to law, depose and say as follows, to wit:

That they are licensed medical practitioners of 6 years and upward and 13 years and upward, respectively, and as such were duly requested to make a post-mortem examination upon the body of one Fannie Sellens, who came to her death on August 28, 1918, at or near the Allegheny Steel Co. coal mine in West Natrona, Harrison Township, by reason of gunshot wound there and then received; that said post-mortem examination was made on Monday, October 13, 1919, at 10 a. m., in the Union Cemetery at Arnold, Westmoreland County, Pa., for which purpose the body of the said Fannie Sellens was disinterred; that an examination revealed—

1. Gunshot wound on left cheek bone taking a straight course in the head;
2. A second gunshot wound on left side of face going inwardly to the front or left direction of the head and apparently having its point of exit through the forehead of deceased;
3. A gunshot wound was revealed entering in the left posterior scapular region about 2 inches to the left of the spinal column on a line level with the clavicle taking a downward and inward course into the chest cavity; any of the three foregoing gunshot wounds could have been fatal.

Affiants do further aver that the coroner's findings as recorded by the coroner of Allegheny County, at No. 229 September term, 1919, in Inquisition Docket, volume 133, page 629, reports and indicates death "was due to gunshot wound in left temple" and said finding aforesaid do not show or state anything about the gunshot wound in the posterior region such as is marked No. 3 above in the within affidavit.

All of which is true and correct as affiants verily believe.

WILLIAM NOLAN,  
GEO. L. KRIEGER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

MARIETTA CANCELLIERE,  
Notary Public.

My commission expires January 2, 1923.

The CHAIRMAN. Here are a number of statements from the superintendent of the State police that they want to put in. There are a number of these affidavits and I have sifted these out.

(The affidavits above referred to are printed in the record in full, as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE,  
Harrisburg, Pa., October 13, 1919.

Senator WILLIAM S. KENYON,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Immediately upon reading the charges made against the State police by Rev. Kazenka, of 416 Frazier Street, Braddock, Pa., I directed Capt. Mair, of the Pennsylvania State police force to make a thorough and personal investigation of these charges, and I inclose for your information his report, together with the statements of the two officers who were charged with abusing their authority, Pvts. Joseph M. Keifer and Eugene B. McAndrew, and also statements made by Mrs. Jennie Moran, S. J. Biederman, and Leonard Jacobowitz, who were eyewitnesses of the scene referred to in the charges made before your commission.

I have at my office about 50 voluntary affidavits from borough officials, business and professional men concerning the conduct of the State police during the recent disturbances at Clairton, Sharon, McKeesport, and other points which I will be glad to furnish you if you indicate a desire to have them.

Permit me to add that my services are at your disposal, together with the records of this force, if I can be of any assistance in conducting your investigation.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE F. LUMB, *Acting Superintendent.*

OCTOBER 11, 1919.

The SUPERINTENDENT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE,  
Harrisburg, Pa.

SIR: I have the honor to report herein the result of my investigation of the charges of the Rev. A. Kazenka, of 416 Frazier Street, Braddock, Pa., relative to the alleged misconduct of State policemen while on duty at Braddock, Pa., during September 22 and 23, 1919:

Statements from several citizens are hereto attached, which plainly show that the State police did not exceed their authority, and that the Rev. Mr. Kazenka has no grounds for any specific complaint but has indulged in vague general charges. The two policemen to whom Father Kazenka directs his attack in regard to the matter of interfering with men who had attended divine service, are Pvt. Joseph M. Keifer of Troop A, State police, enlisted November 1, 1918, and Pvt. Eugene B. McAndrew of Troop A, State police, enlisted February 1, 1919.

On the morning of September 22, 1919, which was the day of the beginning of the strike, Corpl. Nelson W. Smith, of Troop A, State police, who was in command of the substation at Braddock, Pa., ordered the two State policemen, as mentioned above, to patrol a certain district of Braddock, with orders to move all persons who were gathered in crowds on or near the public highways of the borough. I wish to call attention to the fact that the sheriff of Allegheny County, in which Braddock is situated, asked to have a detail of State police at that particular borough, as it was feared that there would be trouble there. Through careful investigation, I find that one of the chief reasons for this supposition was due to the fact that the Rev. A. Kazenka, pastor of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church, was greatly in favor of the strike and had openly championed its cause, and his attitude had been more of a strike organizer than that of a pastor. I have been informed that Father Kazenka's parish embraces approximately 1,500 of the strikers in and about Braddock, and that they are mostly all Slavish. On the morning of September 22, 1919, a mission was in progress in Father Kazenka's church, which is situated near the corner of Braddock Avenue and Eleventh Street, Braddock; services commenced at 9 a. m. and shortly after the services were over, which was about 10 a. m., Pvts. Keifer and McAndrew rode down the street and noticed crowds of men congregated on both sides of Braddock Avenue, making no effort to



separate. The two State policemen started to move the crowd, which extended on both sides of Braddock Avenue, a block each way from the church; and, after having the situation well in hand, every one practically moving along in a normal manner, and when they were directly in front of the church, two priests came out from the church property and approached Pvt. Keifer, who was nearest to them, and complained that the State police had no right to interfere with their religious service. Pvt. Keifer remarked to them that he had not known that services had been in progress and besides that this was a time of strike, and that the men who had been moved were in the strike zone, and were not either going or coming from church, as they were assembled in crowds on the public highway. He then rode away from the church and continued his patrol.

From a thorough investigation I do not find that the State police interfered in any manner with the service in Father Kazenka's church, nor did they use any abusive language or inflict any injury upon the priests whatsoever; that they did not use their batons nor draw them from the holsters or make any attempt to use force on the crowd, and I can not find that anyone suffered physical injury through the performance of this duty. I believe that, notwithstanding the fact that these men had been to church that morning, that if they had been allowed to remain in groups upon the streets of Braddock that morning that trouble might have resulted, as there were no women or children among them.

Relative to the statement of Father Kazenka in his letter to W. Z. Foster, under date of September 27, 1919, in which he states that the State police rode into some school children on the afternoon of September 23, I believe that this was occasioned by the fact that Corpl. Nelson W. Smith and Pvt. John J. Tomack arrested a foreigner for having firearms in his possession, and while the State policemen had the prisoner before a 'squire some school children gathered around the horses, which were tied outside the 'squire's office, and the policemen seeing that the children were in danger of being kicked, chased them away just previous to their mounting their horses and leaving the vicinity.

It is extremely difficult to run down all these little incidents, as in most cases the reports of the alleged misconduct of the State police are not based on the truth.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM E. MAIR,  
*Captain State Police, Commanding Troop A.*

---

STATEMENT OF MRS. JENNIE MORAN, 1030 BRADDOCK AVENUE, BRADDOCK, PA.

I, Mrs. Jennie Moran, do state that about 9 a. m., September 22, 1919, while in my grocery store, together with Hilda Johnson, who is my clerk, which is directly opposite and across the street from St. Michael's Roman Catholic Slavish Church, of which Rev. A. Kazenka is rector, I observed that the church was out at least 10 minutes and I saw the mounted State police asking the men to move on in a quiet and orderly manner, which they did. I saw one trooper on the sidewalk near the church; he was also asking the men to move on. I did not see the rector and the other priest come out of their church, but I saw them on the outside and the Rev. Kazenka, who was raising his hands and was what I call furious, and the trooper said something and moved away. There were no clubs used or drawn; the troopers did not use any violence and the churchgoers were given ample time to disperse, and were in no way interfered with in their worship nor services. I am more than glad to know that the business people are getting protection, as I am a widow with two children and also a member of the St. Thomas Catholic Church of this town. I did not see any trooper on the church step nor on the lawns.

Miss Hilda Johnson, a clerk in Mrs. Moran's store, substantiated Mrs. Moran's statement, these two women being together when the supposed trouble took place.

This statement was obtained from Mrs. Jennie Moran and Miss Hilda Johnson at Braddock, Pa., October 9, 1919, by Sergt. J. L. Tressel, of Troop A. State police, in the presence of Capt. Dailey, of Braddock, Pa.

Mrs. Moran on account of being in business and dealing to a great extent with men who are on strike, and Miss Hilda Johnson, due to the fact that she is employed as a clerk in Mrs. Moran's store, would not consent to make affidavit, but willingly gave the above information.

---

STATEMENT OF MR. S. J. BIEDERMAN, 1028 BRADDOCK AVENUE, BRADDOCK, PA.

I, S. J. Biederman, proprietor of a gents' furnishing store at No. 1028 Braddock Avenue, Braddock, Pa., and speaking nearly all of the foreign languages, do state that my place of business is almost directly opposite the St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church (Slavish Church); that a few days after the affair at the Slavish Church, a foreigner came into my store, his name and identity I can not recall, as nearly all of my business is with that class of people. This foreigner started to talk about the affair and the actions of the State police and that of the rectors on September 22, 1919, he saying that after the church was out, about 10 minutes or so, the State police came and gave us orders to clear the sidewalks and not to gather, and to move on, and keep moving, which we did, and one of the men went into the church and told Father Kazenka, who is our rector, and he came out and started to talk to the police, and they told him that they had orders to not allow any congregating on the sidewalks and that these orders must be carried out, and they left him. This made him rave. He also told me that there was no violence used by the State police in moving the foreigners and that they moved quickly, nor did the State police use their clubs or guns, and that they did not interfere with the divine church services and were not on the church steps.

This statement was obtained from Mr. S. J. Biederman at Braddock, Pa., on October 9, 1919, by Sergt. J. L. Tressel, Troop A, State police, in the presence of Capt. Dailey of Braddock, Pa.

Mr. Biederman, on account of being in business and dealing to a great extent with men who are on strike, would not consent to make affidavit but willingly gave the above information.

---

STATEMENT OF MR. LEONARD JACOBOWITZ, 1034 BRADDOCK AVENUE, BRADDOCK, PA.

I, Leonard Jacobowitz, proprietor of a drug store at 1034 Braddock Avenue, Braddock, Pa., noticed two State policemen dispersing a crowd that had assembled on the sidewalks in the vicinity of my store, about 10 a. m., September 22, 1919. My store is directly opposite and facing St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church. I saw two State policemen first going down the street ordering people to move on, then about 10 or 20 minutes afterwards they returned and started to move those who had not obeyed them when they first rode up. There were many men crowded on the sidewalks on both sides of the street. I saw the State policemen order many of the foreigners crowded in front and near my store to move, but I did not see any one struck, nor did the State policemen when I saw them have their clubs in their hands or any other weapon. When the State policemen were directly in front of the church the second time, I saw two priests come out and speak to them. I did not hear what was said, but shortly afterwards the State policemen rode away. The crowd had dispersed by this time. In my opinion, the incident did not amount to very much, as there was no great excitement, no blows struck, or, as far as I could learn, any one injured.

This statement was obtained from Mr. Leonard Jacobowitz, of 1034 Braddock Avenue, Braddock, Pa., on October 9, 1919, by Capt. William E. Mair, Troop A, State police, in the presence of Pvt. Ralph H. Stephens of Troop A, State police.

Mr. Jacobowitz, on account of being in business and dealing to a great extent with the men who are on strike, would not consent to make an affidavit, but willingly gave the above information.

BRADDOCK, PA., October 9, 1919.

The COMMANDING OFFICER,  
*Troop A, State Police, Greensburg, Pa.*

SIR: I have the honor to submit the following report of duty performed by myself, in company with Pvt. Kelfer, while on special mounted patrol:

Having been ordered by Corpl. Smith to patrol the streets of Braddock, Pa., and disperse crowds, about 10 a. m., we noticed probably 2,000 men on Braddock Avenue between Ninth and Thirteenth Streets. These men were not moving along but were standing in groups and were disobeying the proclamation of the sheriff of Allegheny County, to the effect that they were not allowed to congregate on the streets in gangs. I, together with Pvt. Kelfer, ordered these men to move along. It was not necessary to use any force whatsoever. Neither myself nor Pvt. Kelfer drew our batons from our holsters. While ordering the crowd to move and when in front of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church at Braddock Avenue and Eleventh Streets, two priests came out from the church property into the street and approached Pvt. Kelfer, who was nearer to them than I, and from one of the priest's actions, he appeared to be very much excited, as he was waving his arms and attracting a great deal of attention. I did not hear what was said but Pvt. Kelfer immediately joined me and told me that the Polish priest was very angry because we had moved the men and said that these men had just left church. We had been in the vicinity upward of about 20 minutes moving the crowds along the street, who were, as stated above, blocking the sidewalks, and did not order anyone to move on who was already in motion or actually on the church property. It was evident from the number of men congregated on the sidewalks, even though they had been to church, had no intention of going to their homes quietly, but, as stated above in my report, were ganged upon the sidewalks. Neither myself nor Pvt. Kelfer stayed longer in the vicinity of the church than was necessary.

Very respectfully.

EUGENE B. McANDREW.

GREENSBURG, PA., October 10, 1919.

The COMMANDING OFFICER,  
*Troop A, State Police, Greensburg, Pa.*

SIR: I have the honor to respectfully submit the following report of duty performed by Pvt. Kelfer, in company with Pvt. McAndrew, while on special mounted patrol, September 22, 1919:

Having been ordered by Corpl. Smith to patrol the streets of Braddock, Pa., for the purpose of dispersing crowds and maintaining order, about 10 a. m., we noticed approximately 2,000 men on Braddock Avenue, between Ninth and Thirteenth Streets. These men were not moving along but were standing in groups, thus blockading the sidewalks as well as disobeying the proclamation of the sheriff of Allegheny County, to the effect that crowds were not permitted to congregate on the streets. I, together with Pvt. McAndrew, ordered these men to move along, which command did not necessitate the using of any force; in fact, neither myself nor Pvt. McAndrew drew our batons from our holsters.

While ordering the crowd, which had congregated in front of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church at Braddock Avenue and Eleventh Street, to move along, two priests came out from the church property into the street. From one of the priest's actions, he appeared to be very much excited, in view of the fact that he was waving his arms, thus attracting a great deal of attention. This priest, in a very angry mood, walked up to me and said: "What are you doing here?" I replied, "According to the proclamation issued by the sheriff of Allegheny county crowds are not permitted to assemble in this street, it being within the strike zone; therefore, we are compelling the crowd to move on." The priest said, "These men have just left the church." We had been in the vicinity upwards of about 20 minutes moving the crowds along the street, who were, as stated above, blocking the sidewalks, and did not order anyone to move on who was already in motion or actually on the church property. It was evident from the number of men congregated on the sidewalks, even though they had been to church that morning, had no intention of going to their homes quietly, but, as stated above in my report, were ganged up on the sidewalks. Pvt. McAndrew and myself only stayed long enough in the vicinity of the church that we might hear what the priest had to say.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH M. KEIFER,  
*Private, Troop A, State Police.*

## PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, MONESSEN, PA.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Westmoreland*, ss:

Before me, J. B. White, a justice of the peace, in and for said county and State, personally appeared Aloysius Hinnenkamp, a private of Troop "B," Pennsylvania State police force, who being duly sworn according to law deposes and says, that Pvt. Cameron and myself were at Twelfth and Shoonmaker Streets, Monessen, Pa., about 8.30 a. m., October 6, 1919, when Sergt. Link, who had charge of us, ordered us to disperse a crowd, who had assembled at Eleventh and Shoonmaker Streets.

Pvt. Cameron and myself proceeded to this place and Cameron ordered the crowd to disperse, which they started to do, when one man whom I afterwards learned was John Brada, said to them, "Don't move; stay right here." Cameron then ordered the crowd for the second time to move, when John Brada again said "Don't move; stay right here." Cameron then ordered John Brada to move on. Brada turned and put his right hand into his right rear pocket and said, "You son a bitch, you can't make me move." Cameron then drew his baton and hit Brada on the head with it. After Cameron hit Brada, he ran into the store saying, "You son of a bitch, I will get you."

Pvt. Cameron then signaled to Sergt. Link, who was still at corner of Twelfth and Shoonmaker Streets, who came up right away and placed Brada under arrest.

ALOYSIUS HINNENKAMP.

Sworn and subscribed before me, this 13th day of October, A. D. 1919.

JAMES B. WHITE,  
*Justice of the Peace.*

My commission expires the first Monday in January, 1924.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Westmoreland*, ss:

Personally appeared before me, J. B. White, a justice of the peace in and for said county and State, one E. H. Cameron, a private of Troop B, Pennsylvania State police force, who being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says, that Pvt. Hinnenkamp and myself were at Twelfth and Shoonmaker Streets, Monessen, Pa., about 8.30 a. m., October 6, 1919, when Sergt. Link instructed us to disperse a crowd of men who were interfering with men going to work at Eleventh and Shoonmaker Streets.

Pvt. Hinnenkamp and myself proceeded to this place and ordered the crowd, which numbered about 15, to disperse, which they started to do, when John Brada, who was in the crowd and standing near the curb, stopped the crowd and said, "Don't move; stay right here." I then ordered the crowd for the second time to disperse, when John Brada again said, "Don't move; stay right here." I then ordered the said John Brada to move on. He turned and faced me, at the same time putting his right hand into his right rear trousers pocket, and said "You son of a bitch, you can't make me move." I then drew my baton, striking for Brada's right arm, when he ducked to one side, my baton striking him on the head. Brada then went into the store, saying "You son of a bitch, I will get you."

I then signaled to Sergt. Link, who was in vicinity of Twelfth Street, who took up the trot, and upon his arrival placed Brada under arrest.

E. H. CAMERON.

Sworn and subscribed before this this 13th day of October, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

JAMES B. WHITE,  
*Justice of the Peace.*

My commission expires on the first Monday in January, 1924.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
*County of Westmoreland*, ss:

Before me, J. B. White, justice of the peace in and for said county and State personally appeared Elmer Leithiser, a lieutenant of Troop B, State police, who being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he was in command of the detachment of State police stationed in Monessen, Westmoreland

County, on October 6, 1919, and that on October 6, 1919, Pvts. Cameron and Hinnekamp, submitted a statement to him covering the arrest of John Brada, a merchant of Schoonmaker Avenue, near Eleventh Street, Monessen, Pa., and that the attached statements are a true and correct copy of the statements submitted to him on October 6, 1919, by Pvts. Cameron and Hinnekamp covering this arrest. The original statements being submitted to the commanding officer Troop B, State police, Wyoming, Pa., under date of October 10, 1919, by the said Lieut. Elmer Leithiser.

ELMER LEITHISER.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

JAMES B. WHITE,  
Justice of the Peace.

TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF REPORT SUBMITTED BY PVTS. CAMERON AND HINNEKAMP ON OCTOBER 6, 1919, TO LIEUT. ELMER LEITHISER, COMMANDING MONESSEN DETACHMENT STATE POLICE.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, TROOP B,  
Monessen, Pa., October 6, 1919.

Lieut. ELMER LEITHISER,

*Commanding Detachment State Police, Monessen, Pa.*

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to respectfully submit the following report relative to duty performed by Pvt. Hinnekamp and myself at Eleventh and Schoonmaker Streets, Monessen, Pa., about 8.30 a. m., October 6, 1919.

Pvt. Hinnekamp and myself were at 12th and Schoonmaker Streets with Sergt. Link, when a crowd assembled at 11th and Schoonmaker Streets, Sergt. Link instructed us to disperse the crowd.

We proceeded to the above said place and ordered the crowd, which numbered about 15 and who were stopping men who were going to work, to disperse, which they had started to do when John Brada, who was in the crowd and standing near the curb stopped the crowd and said, "Don't move, stay right here." I then ordered the crowd for the second time to disperse, when John Brada again said, "Don't move, stay right here." I then ordered the said John Brada to move on. He turned and faced me at the same time putting his right hand into his right rear trousers pocket and said, "You son of a bitch, you can't make me move." I then drew my baton striking for Brada's right arm, at the same time Brada ducked to one side and I struck him on the head instead of the arm. Then Brada went into his store saying, "You son of a bitch, I will get you."

I then signaled to Sergt. Link, who was in the vicinity of Thirteenth Street and who had already started toward Eleventh Street; Sergt. Link took up the trot at once, and upon his arrival John Brada was placed under arrest and the crowd dispersed.

Respectfully,

E. H. CAMERON,  
Private, Troop B, State Police.  
ALOYSIUS HINNEKAMP,  
Private, Troop B, State Police.

Senator PHIPPS. I have here a communication from a workman whom I have known for 35 or 40 years and who is employed in one of the steel mills in Pittsburgh. It is an interesting letter giving his viewpoint. I have had it typed from his own handwriting for the convenience of the stenographer. It is very interesting and gives the workmen's viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be printed in the record.

(The letter above referred to is here printed in full in the record, as follows:)

Mr. L. O. PHIPPS.

MY DEAR FRIEND AND SENATOR: When you were in Pittsburgh I tried to connect with you by phone, but could not. I would have liked very much to have met you and to have a talk with you concerning the business that brought you here. I might have seen you on Sunday, but being up very late on

Saturday night I was late getting up on Sunday morning, and being 7 miles from the court I thought it useless to try it.

Well, to begin with, as we understand it, this strike was for recognition of the union, or, as the leaders intended, to have closed shops—so that no man could find work until he had first joined the union, finally having every man a union man. It was their blind and hopeless wish to overthrow the mill owners and employers, confiscate their property, and, as has been told to the men, that *they* would be mill owners. W. Z. Foster stated to a reporter of either the Post or Gazette—he said that he started organizing for this strike one year ago—he and three or four others. We are now about 1,000 strong, and this strike is the first step in *revolution*. And yet Mr. Samuel Gompers told your committee that Foster had given up his former I. W. W. ideas. Martin Tighe said there was no *vicious* element among the strike leaders. What more viciousness do you want than men who urges revolution? Anarchists is what we consider them.

The high wages of the war period has made everybody money mad—which they still want—or *more*. Well, the war is over, and we were going along nicely. Everybody appeared to be contented until these agitators came along, and by lies and deception persuaded the ignorant and gullible foreigners to join, at \$3 apiece—one of which went to the organizer—and as \$6,000 was taken in, in fees, at Youngstown in one day, you can readily see the cause of their anxiety for the “poor” laborer. They cared little about him, it was to replenish their pockets, and incidentally make the men think they were working for their interest, but the poor dupes are slowly but surely finding out, and are returning to work. And many others would do so, only fearing the threats may operate against them. One of our men, going home from work received two stabs in the back, and may still be in the hospital. My niece's husband was threatened, and one morning seeing the men lying in wait went back home and got his defender. Starting again he met them in the street, parleyed with them until he succeeded in getting them (four) all arrested.

When your committee asked the men why they struck they dare not tell you, but they had to give you a reason. So they said they wanted more money—that they could not meet the high cost—and as things are now—they never will—for high wages is not the remedy. Nothing less than severe punishment will stop profiteering, for, either in Johnstown or Greensburg, an investigator, asking a grocer why he raised his prices said that when the men got a 15 per cent increase we was compelled to raise his prices 25 per cent. Another striker asked what he would do when his money was gone. We don't want money. We got union card. We go grocery store, show my card. We get all we want. We want ride on car. We show card—that's all. Who told you that? Mr. Union Boss. See the deception?

Strikers visited the homes of many workers and threatened them through their wives.

You have heard from Gary; the tolerance of the Government has filled the country with anarchists who openly defy all authority and who will contest deportation. The Government knows these men, and they should be deported as fast as caught, and not allowed to contest the Government's right to deport them. The Government is of the people, for the people, of law-abiding and loyal principles, and anarchists have no rights that anyone must respect. They are the same in any country, never satisfied, no matter where. Why should they—foreigners—be allowed to come here to dictate to Americans what they shall or shall not do. Why is Goldman allowed to contest? Why did the Government fall down? There is nothing that these anarchists love, nor nothing that they want of our civilization. They need to be ruled by the iron hand of a Kaiser or a Czar.

And now Mr. Gompers, having lost control of the leaders and wanting to do something to hold his job, is crying for mediation. Mediation of what? There is nothing to mediate. These agitators came along into “Peaceful Valley,” started a fight for Bolshevik rule, and lost—and that is all there is to it.

Here's to the Stars and Stripes,

Long may she wave

O'er the homes of the loyal

And the anarchist's grave—his proper habitation.

Use this as you wish.

G. FIRMIN.

Senator PHIPPS. Now in regard to this Steubenville situation here is a handbill that I am informed has been displayed generally in Steubenville, and it has been asked that that should go into the record. I shall hold it back for the present.

I also wish to put into the record a sermon delivered by a Catholic priest there and it is not very long.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be printed in the record.

(The sermon above referred to is here printed in the record, as follows:)

ORGANIZERS OF STEEL STRIKE ARE BRANDED AS RADICALS BY LOCAL CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN—THE REV. THOMAS DEVLIN DECLARES WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, ORGANIZER, IS NO BETTER THAN TROTSKY, LENINE, AND THE BOLSHIEVIKI, AND SCORES AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR—CONGREGATION IS WARNED.

To the EDITOR OF THE CHRONICLE TELEGRAPH.

DEAR SIR: For more than 36 years I have lived among the iron and steel workers of this great city. I believe that no one even of my colleagues has been in closer touch with the men of muscle and brawn who have contributed so much to the building up of our Nation. My home is in the shadows of a forest of smokestacks of the largest steel mill in Pittsburgh. The whirr of machinery, the rumbling of the trains, the noise and din of ceaseless industry sound in my ears day and night. Two generations of working men whom I have served in the most intimate relationship will testify to my interest in and devotion to the working man. For him I have sacrificed health, pleasure, comfort, preferment. No one, therefore, can suspect me of any lack of sympathy with, or unfriendliness toward, Nature's nobleman, the honest toiler of the Nation, when I criticize the motives and methods of those who are conducting the movement for the organization of the iron and steel workers. I admit that there are many things in the conditions of the industrial, economic, and social life of the workers which call loudly for betterment. Today when the world is being reconstructed the need of social justice is recognized more and more by the enlightened public. The desired improvement will not be obtained, however, by promoting ill-feeling and discontent, or through strikes or class warfare. The President of the United States has suggested the proper method for the settlement of the differences which have occasioned the present strike. He has called a conference of representative employers and employees in which all questions in dispute will be considered calmly and reasonably.

The American Federation of Labor, however, seems to have fallen into the hands of the Bolsheviks and the Reds. It has refused to listen to the appeal of President Wilson to await the result of the conference. It has turned a deaf ear to the request of its own superior officer to comply with the President's wish, and has appointed a professed syndicalist, William Z. Foster, a vice president of the American Federation of Labor, to organize the steel workers in the great Pittsburgh district.

William Z. Foster has written a book in which he describes himself and his fellow syndicalists as unscrupulous in their choice of weapons to fight their battles with capitalism. They allow no consideration of legality, religion, patriotism, honor, duty, or anything else to stand in the way of the adoption of effective tactics. The only sentiment they know is loyalty as they see it to the interests of the working classes. They are in utter revolt against capitalism in all its phases. The syndicalist movement, Foster says, is a union-labor movement which intends to overthrow capitalism and disorganize society. This movement sees in the State only an instrument of oppression and a bungling administration of industry, and proposes to exclude it from future society. It sees no need for any general supervising governmental body. To accomplish its purposes it proposes to disorganize the police and military forces, or so weaken them as to render them inefficient. It will make use of sabotage and every method, whether underhand or unmanly. No consideration of what is just, fair, or civilized will restrain it. Its principle is—the end justifies the means.

The Kaiser, Hindenburg or Von Tirpitz have nothing on Foster. He is in the class of Trotsky, Lenine, and the Bolsheviks.

This, then, is the man who has been appointed by the American Federation of Labor to organize the honest, hard-working men of Pittsburgh and to promote a strike during the period of the world's economic readjustment.

Why do not our sensible sons of toil resent the insult offered them by the appointment of a syndicalist to direct them?

Why do not the civil authorities arrest and imprison a professed anarchist worse in his teachings than Bergman, Goldman, or any of the Russian Reds?

As for the men of Holy Cross, I have every confidence in their intelligence and good judgment and have no fear that they will be influenced by the sophistries of the radicals, but as a matter of precaution I have given warning that if any should follow the leadership of Foster it would be equivalent to indorsing his doctrines and I should regard them as apostates from the Catholic faith, traitors to their country, and enemies to authority.

THOMAS DEVLIN,  
Pastor of Holy Cross Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

**AFFIDAVITS REGARDING ARREST AND DISPOSITION OF CASE BOROUGH OF MONESSEN  
V. MARY WINTSKY ON OCTOBER 6, 1919, AND OCTOBER 7, 1919.**

Affidavits: Harry L. Brandis, patrolman; J. M. Lavrinc, patrolman; W. B. Stewart, chief burgess.

I, Chauncey S. Duvall, hereby certify that I am a notary public in and for the county of Westmoreland, State of Pennsylvania, with an office at Monessen, Pa.; that my commission expires March 10, 1921, and that the attached affidavits were taken before me on October 13, 1919.

Witness my hand and seal this 13th day of October, 1919.

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

*County of Westmoreland, ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came H. L. Brandis, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is an officer in the Borough of Monessen and has been on the police force for two and one-half years past. He further states that on October 6, 1919, at about 6 p. m. he was on duty on Morgan Avenue near Twelfth Street, and while patrolling came upon a crowd of possibly 100 or more excited foreigners. He attempted to disperse the mob and was succeeding very well when a woman threw a bottle at an officer. He succeeded in taking a bottle away from another woman who was about to throw it, and while attempting to disperse the crowd further Mrs. Wintsky threw a handful of pepper at his face, part of which went in his right eye. He immediately placed Mrs. Wintsky under arrest, and while taking her to the patrol wagon at Twelfth Street and Schoonmaker she resisted, scratching his face and striking him repeatedly. He used her as gently as he could possibly do under the circumstances. He further states that her hearing was set for 8 a. m., October 7, 1919, and a forfeit of \$50.00 was deposited by her husband, John Wintsky, for her appearance and that he was at the hearing at 8 a. m. October 7, 1919, and remained until 9.30 a. m., but neither Mary Wintsky or John Wintsky, her husband, appeared at the burgess's office. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

HARRY L. BRANDIS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

*County of Westmoreland, ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came J. M. Lavrinc, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is a special policeman in the Borough of Monessen and has been doing active patrol duty since September 23, 1919; that he accompanied Officer H. L. Brandis when he was patrolling Morgan Avenue on October 6, 1919, and that he was personally



present when Mrs. Mary Wintsky was arrested and that the facts set forth in the affidavit of H. L. Brandis are true and correct in every particular to the best of his knowledge and belief.

J. M. LAVRINC.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Westmoreland, ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came W. B. Stewart, who is chief burgess in the borough of Monessen, and who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he conducted police court on October 7, 1919, at 8 a. m., and that Mary Wintsky, who was arrested on October 6, 1919, did not appear for a hearing between the hours of 8 a. m. and 9.30 a. m., the time set for the hearings in the borough of Monessen, and that he declared the \$50 deposited for her appearance as forfeited. He further states that Mrs. Mary Wintsky never came to the borough building and demanded a hearing after her arrest. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

W. B. STEWART.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

AFFIDAVITS REGARDING ARREST AND DISPOSITION OF CASE, BOROUGH OF MONESSEN  
V. MARY BANKS, ON OCTOBER 6, 1919, AND OCTOBER 7, 1919.

Affidavits: Lieutenant of Police George W. Albright; Philip Pascoe, patrolman; George A. Brandis, patrolman; William C. Bumbaugh, patrolman; John B. Thompson, patrolman; Charles Wadsworth, patrolman; W. B. Stewart, chief burgess; Paul R. Fox, desk sergeant; Marcel R. Colas, patrolman.

I, Chauncey S. Duvall, hereby certify that I am a notary public in and for the county of Westmoreland, State of Pennsylvania, with an office at Monessen, Pa., and that my commission expires March 10, 1921, and that the attached affidavits were taken before me on October 13, 1919.

Witness my hand and seal this 13th day of October, 1919.

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Westmoreland, ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came George W. Albright, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is lieutenant of police in the borough of Monessen and has been for the past five years. He further states that on October 6, 1919, at about 6. p. m. he received a call from a policeman on duty on Twelfth Street near McMahan Avenue requesting that a larger force be sent, as they were not able to disperse a mob of men, women, and children, possibly 100 or more in number, in that locality. He, with the assistance of three other police officers, rushed to the scene to help quiet the disturbance. The mob was calling the police officers "scabs." Arriving there he found Mrs. Mary Banks with a club about three feet long in her hand. He asked her what she was going to do with the club. She threw it down and called Officer Pascoe a son-of-a-bitch and attempted to create a disturbance and continued in a disorderly manner. He, Albright, immediately placed her under arrest. She was taken to the lockup and later was released on a \$50 forfeit for her appearance at a hearing set for 8 a. m. on October 7, 1919. He further states he was at the office of the burgess at 8 a. m. on October 7, 1919, and remained there until 9.05 a. m., and that the said Mary Banks had not appeared at that time for her hearing. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

GEO. W. ALBRIGHT.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

**STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Westmoreland, ss:**

Before me, a Notary Public in and for said county and State, personally came Phillip Pascoe, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is a patrolman in the borough of Monessen and has done police duty in the borough of Monessen for about four years. He states that he accompanied Lieut. Albright on his call to quiet the disturbance at Twelfth Street and McMahan Avenue on October 6, 1919; that he was present with Lieut. Albright, and the facts as set forth by Lieut. Albright in regard to the disturbance and the arrest of Mrs. Mary Banks are true and correct. He further states that he was at the office of the chief burgess between the hours of 8 a. m. and 9.30 a. m. on October 7, 1919, the time set for the hearing of Mrs. Mary Banks, and that she did not appear for a hearing at police court. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

PHILLIP PASCOE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public.*

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

---

**STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Westmoreland, ss:**

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally appeared George A. Brandis, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is a patrolman in the borough of Monessen and has been for the past two months, and that he has been a constable in the second ward for one and one-half years; that he was doing patrol duty on Twelfth Street on October 6, 1919, and that he was personally present when Lieut. Albright arrested Mary Banks, and that the statements made by Lieut. Albright in regard to the conduct and arrest of Mary Banks are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

GEORGE A. BRANDIS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public.*

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

---

**STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Westmoreland, ss:**

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came William C. Bumbaugh, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is a special police officer in the borough of Monessen and has been since September 23, 1919; that on October 6, 1919, he was on duty at Twelfth Street, near McMahan, doing patrol work where a mob of 100 or more were gathered; that he several times cautioned Mrs. Mary Banks about her disorderly conduct during the late afternoon; that she had been acting very disorderly for at least two hours prior to her arrest, and that at no time during this period did she have her baby in her arms; that he was personally present when she was arrested and heard her call Officer Pascoe a son-of-a-bitch and saw her with a club in her hand. He also heard her husband, Andy Banks, caution her to throw the club away or she would get arrested. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

WILLIAM C. BUMBAUGH.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public.*

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

---

**STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,**

*County of Westmoreland, ss.*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came John B. Thompson, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is a special policeman in the borough of Monessen and has been since September 23, 1919; that he was with Officer Bumbaugh at McMahan and Twelfth Streets,

Monessen, Pa., on October 6, 1919; that he has read the statement of Officer Bumbaugh and knows it to be true and correct, he being personally present during the entire disturbance. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

JOHN B. THOMPSON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
*County of Westmoreland, ss.*

Before me, a notary public, in and for said county and State, personally came Charles Wadsworth, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is a special policeman in the borough of Monessen and has been since September 23, 1919; that he was doing patrol duty on Twelfth Street, Monessen, Pa., on October 6, 1919, and that Mrs. Mary Banks acted in a very disorderly manner for two hours prior to the time she was arrested by Lieut. Albright. That he, himself, requested her on five different occasions to move on and quit creating a disturbance. He further states that he was present when Lieut. Albright placed her under arrest; he heard her call Officer Pascoe a son of a bitch and saw her with a club in her hand. He also states that he heard her husband order her to throw the club away or she would be arrested, and says that she did not have a baby in her arms when she was arrested by Lieut. Albright, but that her husband was carrying the baby. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

CHARLES WADSWORTH.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
*County of Westmoreland, ss.*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came T. B. Stewart, chief Burgess of the Borough of Monessen, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he conducted police court on October 7, 1919, between the hours of 8 a. m. and 9.30 a. m. That Mrs. Mary Banks, who was arrested on October 8, 1918, and posted a forfeit of \$50 on that date for her appearance at police court at 8 a. m. October 7, 1919. He further states that Mrs. Mary Banks did not appear at a hearing at 8 a. m. and that he held court open until 9.30 a. m., 30 minutes longer than the usual time for police court. When she did not appear at 9.30 he declared the \$50 posted for her appearance forfeited and closed the case and that about 10 a. m. he met Mrs. Banks and her husband, Andy Banks, on the street and that they wanted the case opened, but he informed them that the case was closed and the money forfeited for her nonappearance. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

W. B. STEWART.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
*County of Westmoreland, ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came Paul R. Fox, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is desk sergeant in the borough of Monessen and has been for about four months past. He further states he was on duty on October 6, 1919, at the time Mrs. Mary Banks was placed in the borough lockup; that she posted a \$50 forfeit for her appearance at a hearing on October 7, 1919, at 8 a. m., and he further

states that he personally told Mrs. Banks the time of her hearing when she was released on the forfeit and that the police court in the borough of Monessen is always conducted between 8 a. m. and 9 a. m. He further states that he was on duty as desk sergeant between the hours of 6 a. m. and 12 m. on October 7, 1919, and that Mrs. Mary Banks did not appear at the police court for a hearing during this time. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

PAUL R. FOX.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

*County of Westmoreland, ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, personally came Marcel R. Colas, who, upon oath, doth depose and say that he is a special policeman in the borough of Monessen, and has been since September 23, 1919. He further states that he was present at the burgess' office on October 6, 1919, when Mrs. Mary Banks was brought to the police station, and that he saw Mrs. Mary Banks place a forfeit of \$50 for her appearance at police court the next morning, October 7, 1919, at 8 a. m., and that he heard Desk Sergeant Fox tell her that her hearing was to be at 8 a. m. October 7, 1919. He further states the facts set forth are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

MARCEL R. COLAS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAUNCEY S. DUVAL, *Notary Public*.

My commission expires March 10, 1921.

#### **TESTIMONY OF LIEUT. DONALD C. VAN BUREN.**

(Lieut. Donald C. Van Buren was thereupon called as a witness, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. Have you given your name to the reporter?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Lieut. Donald C. Van Buren.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your business in life?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I am an attorney by education, and I graduated from the Harvard Law School in 1914. My military rank is Lieut. Donald C. Van Buren, Headquarters Central Department, Chicago. I am assistant to the department intelligence officer there, on the staff of Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood.

The CHAIRMAN. And where have you been since the strike began?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In Chicago. I have operated a great deal in and around Gary, principally in Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we would like to have you tell us what you can about the Gary situation—the strike situation there. Just go ahead in your own way, if you will, and open up and tell us all about that.

Senator PHIPPS. State the first date that you went to Gary, Lieutenant.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I was in Gary officially the morning of the 5th, I believe; Sunday morning that was; the day after the first riot occurred. The riot occurred on Saturday afternoon of the 4th.

Senator PHIPPS. Of October?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. This month; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And was Gary under martial law at that time?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Not at that time; no sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now under martial law?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. It is now under martial law; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When was it put under martial law?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. On Monday night, the 6th of October. I believe that the proclamation was issued a little after 12; it was either Monday night or Tuesday morning; about midnight of that day.

You must understand that the activities of the military intelligence primarily have nothing to do with the civilian population. Information comes to us from time to time from various sources, all sorts of information, and we try to file, index it, and give it to the proper authorities, generally to the Department of Justice. Information of that sort came to us from Gary early this year, away back in March or April, at which time the so-called "reds" were planning a nation-wide strike in order to free the political prisoners.

Parades were prohibited in Chicago, in the cities around Chicago, and there appeared to be an effort to center around Gary. The chief of police, Mr. Forbis, had become very much alarmed, and he came to Chicago, and came to the intelligence office, and asked if there was anything that we could do to help take care of the situation. The parade in Gary had been prohibited. We told him that there was nothing that we could do unless a request came through official channels. He then made a request to borrow some machine guns, saying that he was going to stop that parade at all costs.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of that proposed demonstration?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I believe it was May 3; that is the date that they proposed to have that parade.

However, Chief Forbis secured shotguns and so on, and he asked that we have a man cover that situation, a sort of a witness to what might occur; and we did have a man in Gary at the time that happened. There was no parade. The police stopped the parade.

At that time Chief Forbis gave us various names of Red leaders, men who were agitating all sorts and forms of revolution, talking it openly; and he requested, if possible, that the War Department should take some action in the matter. These matters, of course, were referred to the Department of Justice. I do not know what became of them.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you furnish to the War Department the names of these Reds?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom you say were fomenting the revolution?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That was the report which Chief Forbis gave us at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. And was this revolution designed to overthrow the Government?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you send those to the Department of Justice?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And have these men been prosecuted or anything done to them?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Not to my knowledge; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know why they have not been prosecuted?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. What were their names?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Two of the names of the men to which particular attention were directed at that time—there was a man named Ivanhoff; and another man named Le Gorge. Both of them were reported by Chief Forbis to be engaged in organizing an anarchist club in Gary. De George was reported to be a very dangerous man, a man who had some education along the lines of chemistry.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he an American citizen?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; he was not.

The CHAIRMAN. What was he?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. He was either an Austrian or a Russian. At that time we became particularly interested in De George, because of a complaint that came to our officer concerning the Aetna Powder Co., about four miles from Gary. That company or plant had become dismantled shortly after the armistice was signed, but the reports stated that there were vast deposits of gun cotton back of this plant, outside of the inclosure, which were not protected, which was 100 per cent pure and effective. We made an investigation and we found that the gun cotton was there and that it was 100 per cent pure and was effective. As an estimate, and a very conservative estimate, there was around 100 tons of it back of that plant. It had drained out of the vats into a pond, and as more of it drained into the pond, it gradually filled up the pond; and they had dug a ditch to a second pond, which was also being filled up.

An investigation was made and a report of it was submitted to the Ordnance Department, and the Department of Justice, and the Fire Marshal of the State for some action. That condition still exists in Gary to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. And are these people still there?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No; De George and Ivanhoff had left there. De George moved out to a little town named Miller, a mile or so from the Aetna plant. He being a chemist, it seemed to be a sort of a strange coincidence that he should move there to Miller and operate in the woods near where the gun cotton was left, without any protection.

Just the other day we brought in some samples of that gun cotton, and we found that it dies out in six or eight hours, and it burns just about the same as any smokeless powder. There will be a tremendous flash, and, of course, if it were inclosed in anything, there would be an explosion.

That was the way the attention of our department was first directed to the situation in Gary. The night of Saturday, October 4, a newspaper report published accounts of a big riot in Gary, which had occurred that afternoon. The report stated that the hospitals were filled with wounded men, and the police were driven into the Lake, or something to that effect.

Capt. Campbell and I, in the Intelligence Office, called the Chief of Staff at Fort Sheridan, about 12 o'clock at night, giving him this information. He directed us to proceed to Gary and find out what the true situation was, and in case it was warranted that troops would be called upon.

We proceeded to Gary and arrived there at 4 o'clock in the morning. The streets were so brilliantly illuminated and all the lights were turned on. Great crowds of union pickets paraded up and down Broadway, the main street of Gary, and congregated around the entrance of the main steel plant, which is to the north of Broadway.

I witnessed one little incident that morning which shows the pulse of the situation at that time. There were four or five Negroes attempting to pass these union pickets and to go to work in the mills, I presume. There were probably 15 or 20 pickets gathered around those men. I saw one man, with a union picket badge pinned upon him, grab hold of a Negro, and take him by the shoulder and swing him around, and evidently started to menace the fellow, and several police came in, and the only arrest made was a Negro. He had pulled out a knife that he had of some sort, and they arrested him for carrying concealed weapons.

The situation was very tense. You could feel it in the air and see it in the street. We were in an Army car; and their looks indicated that they had no use for interference on the part of the military officials at that time.

We returned to Chicago Sunday and made our report officially to the Chief of Staff and to Gen. Wood.

In the meantime, Gen. Wood had caused a provisional regiment to be formed of the Fourth Division, Camp Dodge, to be sent to Fort Sheridan as a matter of preparedness. This provisional regiment consisted of about a thousand enlisted men, a little over 100 officers, fully equipped and armed for any emergency, and with a sufficient number of trucks to take them any place at a moment's notice. This regiment was stationed at Fort Sheridan, a short distance north of Chicago, as you know. This was Saturday afternoon.

In the meantime the militia had reported. The militia had been called out. There had been a call for the militia, but they confined their activities to Indiana Harbor and East Chicago, two small towns to the east of Gary, between Chicago and Gary. The same sort of trouble had been experienced there, and a Negro worker had been shot during some trouble there.

A call came from the governor of the State for Federal troops during the afternoon of Monday, I believe, October 5. Col. Williams and myself were immediately dispatched to Gary to establish headquarters for the general. We arrived there probably at 3 o'clock, or 4 o'clock, or something of that sort, and made our temporary headquarters in the office of the mayor. It seems that that afternoon, in defiance of the orders of the mayor, the police department and the militia—and there were only about 175 militiamen in Gary, hardly an ordinary police force—a parade had been staged by the strikers, led by, it was estimated, between 200 and 300 men in uniform, who claimed to be returned soldiers. This parade was staged in open defiance of the orders of the mayor and the authorities of the city of Gary. It has been estimated that there were anywhere from 3,000 to 10,000 people mixed up in this affair. Considering the size of it, the nastiness of the feeling which existed in Gary on all sides, under instructions of the mayor, the police and militia backed down and did not interfere with the parade; but he stated that in his opinion law and order were at an end in Gary and there was a call for troops.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you there then?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No; I got there shortly afterwards. When we came to Gary the streets were lined with people and there was considerable excitement, you could see it—

The CHAIRMAN. The mayor called for troops shortly after the parade, you say?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; he called for troops on Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of the parade?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Monday, October 6, I believe, that afternoon. Eighteen minutes after the call was made the Fourth Provisional Regiment was on the way to Gary. Lieut. Col. Williams and myself were in conference with the mayor and chief of police from that time on. We had already arranged for securing maps, quarters for the troops, guides and scouts as escorts in bringing in these truck trains, and in about an hour Gen. Wood appeared with several of the staff officers and made his headquarters in the office of the mayor and took personal charge of the situation.

The troops arrived at about 11 o'clock that evening. Gen. Wood personally dictated the proclamation which was issued, and which stated that the Federal troops were there to preserve law and order, and that law and order were to be maintained at all costs. He signed that proclamation himself. The proclamation was issued shortly after midnight. The troops immediately took charge of the situation. Gen. Wood stated that the city was under military control and that all direction of the bodies having to do with the enforcement of law and order would be under his supervision from then on.

To my knowledge since that time there has been no trouble, no disturbance of any sort; I do not know of a man who has even received a black eye, I do not believe there has been a shot fired, and the situation in Gary when I left three days ago, so far as law and order was concerned, was as peaceful as a Sunday school picnic.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many men are out on strike, can you give us an idea?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I have heard it estimated that probably about 8,000 or 10,000 are out. Of course, a great many of these mills are working. Some of them are working nearly to normal capacity in that region now. The larger ones are working between 50 and 60 per cent of their normal capacity. The mills in South Chicago, which is not under military jurisdiction, are operating with a much smaller percentage than that. I have been informed.

The CHAIRMAN. The strikers are orderly now, as far as you observed?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; so far as any open, overt act is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you give us any idea of the ratio of aliens among the strikers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I would like to explain, before I answer that question, with your permission, the operation of the intelligence office there.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. When we arrived at Gary we found that the sheriff had sworn in a great many deputies and that he was running a little intelligence office of his own; the police department had



sworn in a great many policemen, and he was running a little intelligence department of his own, and the Loyal American League, composed of citizens who were largely either deputy sheriffs or special policemen—I believe to a man—also had a little intelligence service of its own. So also did the American Legion. They were all of them lined up on this Red proposition, and had a mass of information. The Department of Justice has one man stationed there permanently, I believe, under the jurisdiction of the department, and the Chicago office has conducted investigations in Gary.

So we found that there were a great many agencies working to cross purposes, and that it would be necessary to establish some kind of a central office that would serve as a clearing house for investigations and keeping a card index of men who were reported to be engaged in activities contrary to the proclamation. That office was established October 9, I believe. I was sent out there by the Chief of Staff. I took one of our filing clerks, an expert, a stenographer, a field clerk, some of our agents, and tried to put in a system whereby we could keep track of what was going on.

It was Gen. Wood's express direction that we try to find out if possible what there was to this Red thing and what the situation really was in Gary. So our activities have been largely directed along the line of investigations into the various Red societies in Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to telling us about these Red societies?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; there is not.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have that.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Anyone who speaks of the Red movement, the Bolshevik, the Communists, etc., begins his talk with what I call the Red bible. It is the manifesto of the Communist International held in Moscow March 2 to 6 of this year. Every alleged Bolshevik knows more about this Red bible, this manifesto of the Communist International, than he knows about anything else.

The CHAIRMAN. Has that been printed in this country?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In Chicago. It has been printed in probably every foreign language that there is. I have seen most of them, with the possible exception of Japanese and Chinese, and it may be that it is printed in those languages also.

The CHAIRMAN. It is printed then in foreign languages?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. This is an English translation and I can read this. Of course in investigating the various halls, we found literally tons of Bolshevik literature.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get this. That has been between last May and the present time?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; this has been since we established military law in Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. I see, just a few days?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; within the time the troops moved into Gary up to the present moment all this stuff has come to light. We went after it to find out what there really was to the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you find this anywhere among the strikers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; I have a great many reports on that

which I will be pleased to submit. May I go ahead with what literature there is first, and then see if it connects up with the strikers?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. This is the heart and soul of the Bolshevik movement, this red pamphlet. It is the rule and guide of the conduct of all the Bolsheviks in this country. It is the alpha and omega of the Red movement, and I have underscored certain passages in it that I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it circulated through our mails?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. To some extent. The usual method, I understand, is to send these packages by express, and in that way they are not open to the censor.

Senator McKELLAR. Would you like to read that now?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. I have underscored some of the passages. When one hears of Bolshevism and about the Reds and Communists, a man does not know exactly what that is about.

Senator McKELLAR. Who got that out?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. This was adopted by the Congress of the Communist International at Moscow, March 2-6, 1919, and signed by comrades C. Rakovsky, N. Lenin, M. Zinoviev, L. Trotsky, and Fritz Platten.

Fritz Platten, I understand, is the representative of the German government in the Bolshevik movement, which afterwards ate up the German nation. He, however, is still part of this committee in Russia. That is Fritz Platten, the German member.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there no law on our statute books by which men who circulate this kind of a book and teach that kind of doctrine can be arrested and punished?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I believe there is; I don't know.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know of any?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not know of any specific law.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is not, there had better be, had there not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. This translation was by some one named Ida Ferguson. I believe she is a Chicago woman. I will read a few sentences from this book. In the introduction it says:

This document contains the first authentic, direct message from the conquering proletariat of great Russia to the toiling masses of the world. It breathes an appeal, a demand that will be heard wherever the masses are ground under the heel of imperialistic capitalism and is a glittering milestone on the road to working-class power throughout the world.

Then, also in the introduction, I read this:

It will assist the Socialist movement everywhere into the path of uncompromising revolutionary action that alone can usher in the triumph of international socialism.

I will read a few sentences from this section, which is directed to the proletariat of all lands:

It is our task now to sum up the practical revolutionary expense of the working class, to cleanse the movement of its admixtures of opportunism and social patriotism—

whatever that may mean—

and to gather together the forces of all the true revolutionary proletarian parties in order to further and hasten the complete victory of the communist revolution.

Then, on page 5:

But alongside the dethroned dynasties of the Romanoffs, Hohenzollerns, and Hapsburgs, and the capitalistic cliques of these lands, the rulers of France, England, Italy, and the United States stand revealed in the light of unfolding events and diplomatic exposures in their immeasurable vileness.

The word used is "vileness."

The CHAIRMAN. How many of these did you find around there?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. More of these books than anything else. Then, on page 10, the following:

Only the proletarian revolution can secure the existence of the small nations, a revolution which frees the productive forces of all countries from the restrictions of the national States, which unites all peoples in the closest economic cooperation on the basis of a universal economic plan, and gives even to the smallest and weakest peoples the possibility freely and independently to carry on their national culture without detriment to the united and centralized economy of Europe and of the whole world.

This is the way one little section is closed. It is on page 12:

Colonial slaves of Africa and Asia! The hour of triumph of the proletarian dictatorship of Europe will also be the hour of your liberation!

Then, on page 14:

In an empire of destruction, where not only the means of production and and transportation but also the institutions of political democracy represent bloody ruins, the proletariat must create its own forms, to serve above all as a bond of unity for the working class and to enable it to accomplish a revolutionary intervention in the further development of mankind. Such apparatus in represented in the workmen's councils. The old parties, the old unions, have proved incapable, in person of their leaders, to understand, much less to carry out the tasks which the new epoch presents to them. The proletariat created a new institution which embraces the entire working class, without distinction of vocation or political maturity, an elastic form of organization capable of continually renewing itself, expanding, and of drawing into itself ever new elements, ready to open its doors to the working groups of city and village which are near to the proletariat.

Then, on page 15:

Whenever the masses are awakened to consciousness, workers, soldiers, and peasants councils will be formed.

Then, on page 16:

Civil war is forced upon the laboring classes by their archenemies.

The words "forced upon" are in large type.

The working class must answer blow for blow, if it will not renounce its own object and its own future which is at the same time the future of all humanity.

On page 17:

This makes necessary the disarming of the bourgeoisie at the proper time, the arming of the laborers, and the formation of a communist army as the protector of the rule of the proletariat and the inviolability of the social structure. Such is the Red army of Soviet Russia which arose to protect the achievements of the working class against every assault from within or without. The Soviet army is inseparable from the Soviet State.

On page 19:

As the first International foresaw the future development and pointed the way, as the second International gathered together and organized millions of the proletariats, so the third International is the International of open mass action of the revolutionary realization, the International of deeds. Socialist criticism has sufficiently stigmatized the bourgeois world order. The task of

the International Communist Party. is now to overthrow this order and to erect in its place the structure of the socialist world order. We urge the working men and women of all countries to unite under the communist banner, the emblem under which the first great victories have already been won.

Then, another section, which is headed "Governing rules of the the communistic international." Under the subheading "The capture of political power," page 22, I read this extract:

Seizure of political power by the proletariat means destruction of the political power of the bourgeoisie. The organized power of the bourgeoisie is in the civil state, with its capitalistic army under control of bourgeois-junker officers, its police and gendarmes, jailers and judges, its priests, government officials, etc. Conquest of the political power means not merely a change in the personnel of ministries, but annihilation of the enemy's apparatus of government; disarmament of the bourgeoisie, of the counter-revolutionary officers, of the White Guard; arming of the proletariat, the revolutionary soldiers, the Red Guard of workmen; displacement of all bourgeois judges and organization of proletarian courts; elimination of control by reactionary government officials and substitution of new organs of management of the proletariat. Victory of the proletariat consists in shattering the enemy's organization and organizing of the proletarian power; in the destruction of the bourgeois and upbuilding of the proletarian state apparatus.

Then a little sentence on page 23:

As the opposition of the bourgeoisie is broken, as it is expropriated and gradually absorbed into the working groups, the proletarian dictatorship disappears, until finally the State dies and there is no more class distinction.

That, in my opinion, is almost an anarchistic doctrine. That is the doctrine of the anarchist; in other words, there will be no need of any state at all. They do not want any rule or any ruler of any sort.

On page 27 I read this sentence:

Communism is now being born out of the ruins of capitalism—there is no other salvation for humanity. The opportunists who are making utopian demands for the reconstruction of the economic system of capitalism, so as to postpone socialization, only delay the process of disintegration and increase the danger of total demolition. The communist revolution, on the other hand, is the best, the only means by which the most important social power of production—the proletariat—can be saved, and with it society itself.

This chapter, on page 30, is entitled "The way to victory." I will read as follows:

The revolutionary era compels the proletariat to make use of the means of battle which will concentrate its entire energies, namely, mass action—

That is a favorite socialistic phrase, you see it every day—

With its logical resultant, direct conflict with the governmental machinery in open combat. All other methods, such as revolutionary use of bourgeois parliamentarism, will be of only secondary significance.

Then, on the last page, page 32, I read this:

Down with the imperial conspiracy of capital!

Long live the international republic of the proletarian councils!

That is printed in capital letters:

Moscow, March 2-6, 1919.

This is a little book that is rather interesting and was published by the Chicago Arbeiter-Zeitung Publishing Co., 1642 North Halsted Street.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you more than one copy of that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I only have one with me. That is the start of all the Red talk, all the communistic talk, the foundation for all the action of the so-called socialist organizations.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you find many men familiar with this book?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Oh, yes; that is the one subject they generally talk about; they start making a speech right away.

Senator McKELLAR. And in their talk they use the talk which is laid down here?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Well, some of them will go as far as that, and some of them will shrug their shoulders and say "Well, we don't mean exactly a revolution with the rifle, we mean with the ballot, or if necessary, a general strike." They generally try to qualify it, but they know about that book, and that is what they study and what they read.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you find any definite organization?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; many of them. I have records on a great many of them.

Senator McKELLAR. The societies that are represented by the doctrines of this book have for their purpose the promulgation and use of the doctrines contained herein?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In my opinion; yes, sir. All the radical societies of the country seem to be centering upon that propaganda of Lenine and Trotski, and they call it the manifesto of the Third International. That is their rule and guide; as I say, it is their bible. I call it the Red Bible.

Here is another sample of some of their literature. This is all in foreign language. This little batch was selected by an agent of the Department of Justice who understands Russian. He made this selection on October 13 for the purpose of making, through our office, an official report through regular channels, showing samples, and I gathered it up when I came to Chicago and put it in my valise and brought it here. I will submit it to you. Of course, I have to take his word for it, but he is an agent of the Department of Justice.

No. 1, this is a Red pamphlet printed in Russian, and its title is "Communist." The note of the agent of the Department of Justice in regard to it is this:

A Russian publication printed in Philadelphia, Pa., by the soviet of Russian workers of Philadelphia, containing articles of a general Bolshevik nature, such as the manifesto of the third international and anarchism by I. Bucharin, at the present time assistant to Trotski.

The CHAIRMAN. This is printed by the assistant to Trotski?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. At the present time he is assistant to Trotski; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that this magazine is printed in Philadelphia?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in Russian?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In Russian; yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are there many Russian workers in and around here?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In my opinion they predominate.

Senator McKELLAR. They can not speak the English language?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Very little.

Senator McKELLAR. You have to communicate with them through interpreters?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They can understand ordinary questions, but when you get into anything outside of that—

Senator McKELLAR. They can not understand you?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No.

Senator McKELLAR. About what proportion of the Gary workers out on strike would you say are foreigners?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Oh, a large majority are foreigners. In my examination, sir, of these suspect radicals that have been brought to me or come to my attention, I have not seen one single American born.

Senator McKELLAR. The only American citizens are those citizens that have been naturalized?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A few of them have been naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. Very many?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A very small percentage. The leaders of these organizations are smart enough to have taken out their second papers. They feel they have it on you; but the ignorant worker who has been here maybe 10 or 15 years has not taken his papers. He tells you frankly he does not want to, because he hopes to go back to the old country.

The CHAIRMAN. He does not expect to be an American?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No.

Senator McKELLAR. As far as you can tell, who are the leaders of these strikers in Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I have the list in these records. I would like to present this literature first.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; you may pursue your own course.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No. 2 is a short history of the methods of fighting of the I. W. W. This publication preaches sabotage and the capture of the State by the proletariat.

Senator McKELLAR. What language is that in?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Also Russian. You can see the I. W. W. emblem on there, however.

Senator PHIPPS. Where is that printed?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. It is not given here. I believe this is printed in Chicago. I have seen a great many of these before; these little books are rather common.

No. 3 is Evolution of Industrial Democracy, by A. Woodruff, showing the tendencies and preamble of the I. W. W. You can see the I. W. W. emblem on it. I think that is from Chicago.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that also in Russian?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; it is in Russian.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that these are books that you found in Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Every one. They have been found since the military went in there. We have an office in Chicago, where we have tried to get this stuff together and sort it out, probably as large as this room, and we have a huge pile of these pamphlets, in all languages, with the possible exception of English. Very little is in English.

Senator McKELLAR. Is much of it in the Slavic language?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Some. Next to Russian, the Austrians and Hungarians seem to predominate out there.

Senator McKELLAR. Any in Polish?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Some; yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Any in Italian?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Very little.

No. 4 is "The Land Program of the Anarchist Communists," by Z. Karilem, issued by the Union of Russian Workers, an alleged anarchist organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that is issued by an anarchist organization?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; the Union of Russian Workers, an anarchist organization in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is their principal office? We heard about that from Mr. Margolis the other day.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They have organizations all over the country, but where their principal office is I do not know.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you find an organization of that kind in Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. It has been reported that they have representatives there. I have not found a man that would admit it, however, as yet.

Senator McKELLAR. You have no absolute evidence on that yet?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Did you meet any man there who admitted that he belonged to it?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir. There was an effort to organize it last summer, I understand, but how far they got I don't know. It is very difficult to get this information, because most of them do not speak English, and they shrug their shoulders when they are asked questions and say, "I don't understand."

Senator McKELLAR. And most of them are secret?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; practically all are secret.

No. 5 is "The Crimes of God by War," a book opposing religion, issued by the Union of Russian Workers, an alleged anarchist organization.

Senator McKELLAR. Is that in Russian?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; in 1918; a comparatively recent document.

No. 6 is *The Feat of a Soldier*, by K. Miranoff, issued by the Union of Russian Workers. This book shows when soldiers were sent out on strike duty one of them did not obey the order of the officer, and instead of ordering the strikers to disperse killed his superior officer. It is reported to be a general propaganda book among those who understand Russian.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever find any of those among the soldiers, do you know?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

No. 7 is *Luxury for All*, by Peter Kropotkin, issued by the Union of Russian Workers, this organization to which I have referred.

Senator McKELLAR. In Russian?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In Russian; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the date of that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. 1916.

No. 8 is Moral Beginning of Anarchism, by Peter Kropotkin, a book containing the preamble of anarchism. This is printed in Russian and is dated 1907.

No. 9 is General Strike and Social Revolution, a book written by an anarchist, A. Roller. This is dated 1916 and printed in Russian.

No. 10 is The Program of the Anarchist Communist, a book calling upon the workers to capture the State and property. It also advocates the use of force, violence, and terroristic acts, if necessary.

Senator McKELLAR. In Russian?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In Russian, 1906.

No. 11 is Revolutionary Syndicalism and Anarchism, which advocates the destruction of all political institution. It is printed in Russian and dated 1907.

Senator McKELLAR. That was not written by Mr. Foster, was it?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

No. 12 is the Constitutional Russian Soviet.

No. 13 is the History of the Bolshevik Movement in Russia. This was printed in Russian in 1919. It probably contains many references to the Third International—they all do.

The CHAIRMAN. Who wrote that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The name is not given here, sir. This memorandum I have here was prepared by a Russian agent in the Department of Justice.

No. 14 is Program of the Communist Bolsheviki. It is dated 1919.

No. 15 is the Lessons of the Revolution, by Lenine. It is dated 1919.

The above listed books are issued by the Russian Bolshevik Federation in New York, all 1919 edition. That refers to the publications that I have read.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know where their place of publication is in New York?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No; the Department of Justice, however, must have it. We operated a few days in Gary and this is some of the stuff we got out there.

The CHAIRMAN. I saw some statement in the papers the other day—I don't remember just where—claiming that a great many of those things have been sent into Gary.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I have some in this package; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they have been sent in since the strike in order to create a feeling against the strikers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They have made all sorts of efforts. I have many reports on their activities of one sort and another.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you get these things in houses?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In their halls; sometimes a man in an office would have his pocket full of I. W. W. stuff, and he will pull it out and read it and try to convince you if you will listen to it. We found it in houses; yes. Reports were confirmed that a man was a radical agitator, and it would generally be reported that he had a couple of guns in his possession, and the military would go in, sometimes it was a police and sometimes it was a military guard, and seize this stuff.



No. 16 is the History of the October Revolution, by Trotzki. It is a book describing the capture of the Russian State by the Bolshevik.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the date of that, please?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not see any date on here, sir, and I can not read the Russian.

No. 17 is Political Economy from an Anarchistic Standpoint, by A. Karelin, issued by the Union of Russian Workers. This is dated 1917.

No. 18 is God and Government, by M. Bakunin, issued by the Union of Russian Workers, and is a book preaching the destruction of religion and government.

No. 19 is Bulletins of the Russian Soviet in connection with the Korniloff's Insurrection. It is dated 1917.

No. 20 is From the History of the Socialist Democratic Agrarian Program, by Lenine, dated 1917.

No. 21 is Speeches of Russian Socialist, by Czheidze. It is dated 1917.

The agent to whom I referred makes this note:

"The last three books were printed in Russia and shipped into this country." He refers to 19, 20, and 21. They were purchased in New York City.

Now, here is a sample. Of course, these people all have great quantities of pictures. They generally have a big photograph of Lenine or Trotzky hanging in their parlor and always in their meeting place. Here is a sample of postal cards. We found thousands of these postal cards.

Here are two I. W. W. magazines, printed in Chicago and circulated from the headquarters, from national headquarters, I. W. W. Their Chicago headquarters are at 1001 West Madison Street, sometimes at 119 South Throop Street.

Here are some samples, fees, membership books. Here is a sample I. W. W. membership book (producing these books and exhibiting them to the committee).

This man was also a member of the American Federation of Labor and on strike. We found a great many of them.

Senator McKELLAR. Andrew Dudas.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In some instances I have found them carrying a strike union ticket badge in with their I. W. W. books.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you know he was a member of the American Federation of Labor?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. He had his Federation of Labor book with him. I have a file of the I. W. Ws. I will give you that information.

Let me explain now that our investigation has at no time been concerned in any way, shape, or manner with the merits of the steel strike. We have come across men in the union organization who are members of these radical organizations. We have tried to get the facts, of course, the same as in any other case, but there has been no effort in any way at any time to discredit the American Federation of Labor. I have personally numbers and numbers of times warned these men, particularly I. W. Ws., to stay away from the radical outfits and stick to the American Federation of Labor, and I have said to them that they would be better off if they would do so and save

themselves a lot of trouble; but we have crossed various union members out there—information which I think is as interesting to the American Federation of Labor as anybody else. For instance, it was reported that a man named Richard Verhagen, vice president of the Steel Council at Gary, Ind., was a radical. I will not introduce anything at all of these preliminary reports, because they were hearsay.

Richard Verhagen was requested to come to my office, which he did, and I had a conference with him. This is Richard Verhagen's statement made to me on October 9:

The subject stated he was born in Holland in 1881 and came to the United States in 1901, landing in New York City. He went to Castletown, N. Y., six months; Schenectady off and on for 12 years; enlisted in the Marine Corps February 3, 1903, and discharged 19, 1903, for physical reasons. He completed his citizenship February 26, 1916, in Schenectady, N. Y. The citizenship papers were produced by him, signed by Geo. M. Bostwick, clerk. From New York State the subject went to Detroit, Mich., for six months, and was in Milwaukee two months. Has been in Gary about one year. He is vice president and treasurer of the Steel Council in Gary, being an electrician by trade, and is at present on strike.

Subject stated openly that he belonged to the Socialist Party ever since he was 16 years old, but denies being a member for the last three years, stating that he has had no time for any party except his labor union. He admits that he reads I. W. W. literature and has in possession quantities of I. W. W. literature, and in particular the One Big Union, of March 1, 1919. I believe that was in his pocket. It is an I. W. W. publication. He states he reads the Communist News and has subscribed to Solidarity at certain times. One particular number of Solidarity—which is the official I. W. W. paper—was found with his name and address on it. The subject states he is interested in the I. W. W. as a labor movement.

He frankly admits he believes in the soviet form of government and states that the present form of government of the Nation is not, in his opinion, representative of the majority. He admits having a letter in his possession, which was confiscated, dated September 29, 1914, addressed to the subject as "Dear Comrade," and signed "Yours, for the revolution, Benjamin J. Legere."

Senator McKELLAR. That has a familiar sound.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The subject states that he does not believe in the present form of government; thinks it can be improved. Frankly admits he was opposed to conscription during the war, and is still opposed to any such methods. Admits, furthermore, that he was opposed to our entrance into the war until war was actually declared. Subject is serving as vice president of the Steel Council at Gary, and his office is 2440 West Fifteenth Street.

Senator McKELLAR. What does the Steel Council mean?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That is the council of the various labor unions in Gary which are identified with the American Federation of Labor. He is vice president and treasurer. He states at one place that he was treasurer.

Senator McKELLAR. Did he claim that he belonged to the I. W. W.?  
Lieut. VAN BUREN. No.

Senator McKELLAR. But he believed in it?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. He said he read the literature and was interested in it as a labor movement.

Senator McKELLAR. All right.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. With reference to present labor leaders, Samuel Gompers in particular, he says they are too conservative; they are too slow in their methods; he admits having some knowledge about the French Syndicalist movement, stating that he was in France when a boy. He admits having studied the sabotage movement and knows considerable of its history.

With reference to W. Z. Foster, secretary of the Steel Labor Union, he states that he never knew him until August of this year, when he met him at a Chicago convention.

Senator McKELLAR. What kind of a convention?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. It is not stated.

Subject further states that he does not believe in any form of religion and never goes to church. He states that at one time he knew personally Liebnicht, in Germany, but denies an acquaintance with Von der Goltz, or having any communication with him, or any other member of the military party in Germany.

That answer refers to a report we had that Verhagen had at one time made the statement that he was a very close friend of Von der Goltz and was in communication with him.

Numerous books, pamphlets, and circulars of a revolutionary and anarchist nature in the possession of the subject were confiscated.

The CHAIRMAN. Found in his possession?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In his possession and in his home.

Senator McKELLAR. You can not say what kind of books they were?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I have not those packet files with me. Most of those are in Gary; and I came direct from Chicago; but they can be produced at any time.

Senator McKELLAR. They were mostly radical books and papers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; as extreme as could be printed.

The above statements were made in the presence of several witnesses and a Department of Justice agent, who can be—

To show some of the peculiar angles that developed in this situation at Gary, that report was dated October 9. On October 16 a man by the name of William Reside came to our office and stated that his son Leslie, while on his way home from school, was taken by force into the home of Richard Verhagen, by two boys named Stornath, and severely beaten. This complainant states that Mrs. Verhagen and Mrs. Lagora have frequently called his children "scabs" and have persuaded other children in the neighborhood to do likewise.

Of course, a matter of that kind is simply referred to the State's attorney for action. It is simply intimidation, but the other radical proposition is interesting.

Another report, a man named George Marovich, or Manovich, who is the secretary and treasurer of the Blast Furnace Union in Gary, identified with the American Federation of Labor.

The subject came to my office and made this statement to me:

I live at 2189 Washington Street, and my business is secretary-treasurer of the Blast Furnace Union, 2 or 3.

I did not exactly catch which he said; it was one or the other.

I have been secretary-treasurer for about seven months. I am married and have a 9-year-old boy. I was born in Austria in 1885, and came to the United States in 1903, landing at New York City. I lived in Pittsburgh one year, Milwaukee from 1905 to 1910, and then came to Gary. I joined the Socialist Party in 1909—that is, the South Slavic Federation—but I quit them in 1918, due to personal differences some of us had with Coetkov, editor of the Chicago Socialist paper and author of "Evolution and Revolution" and also the "Working Man's Revolution."

I completed my citizenship in Crown Point, November 20, 1912. The papers I read are the Appeal to Reason, published in Kansas; the New Majority, a socialist union paper, published in Chicago; and I have read occasionally the Solidarity, although I am not identified in any way with the I. W. W.

I attended the Pittsburgh conference of the Mill and Mine Workers' Union, in May, 1919, but did not participate in any way with the movement for a strike May 4, looking toward the freedom of class war prisoners. There was no such motion made at this meeting, and the records will bear me out.

We had information that he was attempting to start such a movement. He denies it in his statement. We also had information that he was a distributor of a paper called the Boomer, an I. W. W. paper, and he denies that.

I never heard of a paper called the Boomer. I have never seen a paper with this title.

I have heard of the Machinery Workers' Industrial Union and believe it to be an I. W. W. organization, but have never had any connection with it.

I get a bundle of papers every month through the post office, consisting of 40 copies of the Miners' Magazine, published in Denver, Colo., which is the magazine of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union, with headquarters in Denver. That is a branch of the American Federation of Labor; perfectly O. K. I give these papers to members of our Gary union free of charge.

I was a delegate to the International Workers' League at Chicago, which met there in July or August of this year. The purpose of this organization is to secure the release of all war and political prisoners, especially Tom Mooney, and including Debs, Kate Richards O'Hare, and W. D. Haywood. The Gary union sent me to Chicago as a delegate. We tried to set a date for a general strike, but could not agree on the time. By a general strike is meant that every working man should stop work in order to secure the release of those prisoners. I think it will take a couple more years now before we are ready. It was wrong to put Debs in jail. I have sympathy for him. Every working man should love Debs because of his fight for the cause. I do not believe Mooney was given a fair trial.

Two of my brothers remained in Austria and were there during the war. I believe they served in the army. My wife recently received a letter from Austria which informed us they were still alive.

This refers to George Marovich, another report dated October 13, by myself:

With subject's permission his office was visited and a copy of the Miners' Magazine was secured. This magazine was as represented, being the organ of the Mine, Mill, and Smelters' Union.

In addition to this magazine several important papers were found, among them being a letter addressed and sent subject from Chicago, dated September 22, 1919, on stationery of the Universal Defense League, giving its headquarters as 119 South Throup Street, Chicago, which are the national headquarters of the I. W. W., and stating its purpose to be a general strike for the release of all class, war, and political prisoners.

Another subject's desk, undated, was headed "Dear Comrade," and was signed "Yours, for revolution, V. Povich, secretary S. S. O., No. 53, of S. P."

Credentials issued subject to the Universal Defense League, dated August 24, 1919, were found in his possession, with receipt for dues for the balance of the

year. Fred W. Bowerman signed these credentials as general secretary-treasurer Wage Workers' Universal Defense League. These credentials are attached to my report.

Subject in his statement denied being a member of the Socialist Party for the past year. A membership card was found, however, with due stamps canceled as late as February 19. Attention is especially directed to the 25-cent stamp attached to the membership card, which is in payment of a special assessment for "Party building antimilitarism."

This was the indorsement of the St. Louis platform, the platform which opposes conscription and got into so much trouble:

A mimeograph letter signed George Haravich, secretary, dated Indiana Harbor, September 9, 1919, headed "Dear Sir and Brother," requests the presence of all members of the union at the Auditorium Hall, September 12, calling attention to the fact that the presidents of 24 international unions are at Washington, D. C., to "secure justice for you or to declare a general strike throughout the country for all men working in the steel industry."

I made a note on my report:

This is believed to be in line with William Z. Foster's syndicalist idea "to bore from within," and shows a very well-defined purpose on the part of the subject to operate as an agent for the Defense League, whose headquarters are in the I. W. W. Hall, Chicago, and secure through the medium of the American Federation of Labor a general strike which has been proposed and advocated by the ultraradicals for some time.

Other literature of a socialistic and Bolshevik nature was found in subject's possession.

Here is a file on the radical leader in Gary, a man by the name of Dimitre Economoff. By the way, both of these papers have been referred, with all the information we have, to the Department of Justice, recommending that their citizenship papers be canceled and that they be deported, or at least proceedings be instituted.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that done?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Right after these reports were made. The agents of the Department of Justice were at Gary, and I just pulled out copies of these reports and handed them to the agents. There have been no official papers filed, however, looking to a step of that kind.

Dimitre Economoff, a lawyer, in no way connected with the American Federation of Labor, but a leader of the Reds in Gary. His case is interesting:

Subject came to the office of the Military Intelligence upon his return from a business trip to Milwaukee and made the following statement.

This is dated October 11, 1919.

My name is Dimitre Economoff, and I reside at 604 West Forty-fourth Avenue. I am an attorney and studied law at the Chicago University and the University of Valparaiso, Indiana. I was born in the city of Trioan, Bulgaria, on May 1, 1887, and came to this country in 1907. It was in the middle of July. I landed at New York and arrived on the ship *Locania* of the Cunard Line. I was in New York two days and then proceeded to Chicago. I secured employment at the Del Prado Hotel and went to school at the Chicago University. In the summer I went to Missouri Valley, Iowa, where I worked as a carpenter. I saved enough money to return to school, going to Valparaiso. While at school there I worked for Mr. Kinsey, the vice president, receiving my room and board. I stayed there one year and came to Gary. I went to work in the coke plant as a carpenter.

Then in 1910 I went to the Northwestern University and worked as a waiter at the University Club. I went back to Valparaiso in 1911, and in August of that year came to Gary to practice law.

I have two cousins in this country—

That is of no particular interest.

I joined the Socialist Party in Chicago in September or October of 1917. It was while at school that I learned of a cigar maker on Sixty-first Street who held meetings for the students and at which Prof. John Kennedy, then of the faculty, often talked. I made the acquaintance with this cigar maker and became active with the Socialist Party from that time. I heard later that Prof. Kennedy was sent to Russia. Now, I belong to the conservative party, of which Berger is leader. I have read the Communist papers, of course.

In my law practice I have at times represented members of the various Socialist branches, including the Russian. I am a member of the South Slavic International Socialist Federation, Twentieth and Washington Streets, this city—Gary—and have participated in discussions there. Our purpose is to educate working people in the Socialist movement.

No; I do not remember ever having seen an American flag hung in our hall, but we have carried both the red and the American flags in parades before we were prohibited from carrying the former emblem. I have studied the proletariat movement and am thoroughly in sympathy with the dictatorship of the proletariat. The soviet form of government would not apply in Bulgaria, neither in this country as yet. We are trying to educate the people for the rule of the majority, so they take charge and run the Government if they should become the majority.

I was one of the leaders in the May Day celebration in Gary, but did not favor the parade, and when it was disbanded I summoned the people to a hall for the meeting. There was a mixture of all Socialist branches and some union organizations at that celebration. Some of the branches in Gary are as follows: Russian Society, 1335 Adams Street; South Slavic, 1995 Washington Street; Hungarian Society, 1309 Washington Street; American Society, now out of existence.

The CHAIRMAN. When did that go out of existence?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. He did not state.

All of us read I. W. W., Bolshevik, and Socialist literature. It is true that Americanism is not dispensed at these clubs. Most, or rather nearly all, of the books are in a foreign tongue, and the Socialist propaganda is printed in foreign languages. I have advised the working people not to go back to their own country, because conditions are better here. In 1912 I did talk some Americanism, but since then I have not.

I know Paul Glaser.

Paul Glaser represents himself as the attorney for the Socialists in Gary at the present time. I have a file on him which I am going to come to next. This is interesting, because it is testimony from a radical concerning a radical.

I know Paul Glaser. When I first came to Gary we practiced law together for about six months. Glaser is a Russian Jew and, I believe, a full citizen. Glaser was kicked out of the Socialist Party. He was not liked. Was a member of our party, but thought we were too slow and joined, first, the Democrats, then the Republicans, and later the Russian Branch Socialists. He was kicked out of all and nothing is left but the I. W. W., and I guess he is, or will be, mixed with them. He is not allowed to speak at a Socialist gathering, but has talked at strike meetings. I hear that he is very radical and urges the men to fight and stick. I would do the same.

This is only hearsay, but I have heard that Glaser talks big and criticizes our form of government in this country. I believe that when a law is a law it should be enforced, and therefore believe in deportation when facts warrant it. I have had no dealings with the union. They would not let me speak at their meetings. The only union head I really know is Oscar Anderson. He was a member of the Socialist Party.

Oscar Anderson is in the room, sitting back of me. Also, Oscar Anderson is the president of the union council in Gary.

I favor the international movement for the proletariat, looking toward the dictatorship of the proletariat. I hope to see it developed in this country and will do all in my power to bring it about. I suppose William Z. Foster believes in that also, but I do not believe in his tactics—sabotage. I do believe in One Union. The Socialist organization has set various dates for a general strike as a political movement to free Debs, Mooney, Kate Richards O'Hare, Victor Berger, and others, and I have supported it. It was attempted, but could not

be realized. I believe their arrests were wrong; they have committed no crime, but are martyrs of the Socialist cause.

Q. What do you think of the Berger trial?—A. I am not ready to answer. I believe it was a movement to keep Berger out of Congress. I think, however, that he is a fit man to have in Congress. I feel they have been crucified for politics and believe there has been a discrimination of justice with regards to the espionage law.

Q. How do you feel about conscientious objectors?—A. They have their own reasons, whether by sect, religion, or politics. I do not think they are included in the political freedom movement.

Q. What do you think of conscription?—A. I am against it, for a voluntary army only, and I believe the St. Louis Socialist platform is correct.

Here is a file on Paul Glaser. The following appears in the Central Labor Union News Strike Bulletin, dated Gary, Ind., Tuesday, October 14, 1919:

Information for strikers. Any strikers needing information regarding legal matters pertaining to the strike should call on Attorney Paul Glaser, legal adviser of the Steel Council, whose office is at 78 Broadway, room 210 Knotts Building, phone 722.

Paul Glaser is a Russian Jew, admittedly so. He came to my office of his own accord one day, and I had quite a talk with Paul Glaser. He is a very shrewd and a very well-educated man in his way. I asked him if he was a Socialist, and he says, "You bet I am a Socialist." "Are you a Bolshevik?" "You bet I am a Bolshevik, and I am proud of it," intimating "What are you going to do about it?"

I recommended to every agency out in Gary that they institute proceedings to cancel Paul Glaser's citizenship papers, as he is a radical agitator and anti-American in every thought and action.

The Chicago Tribune within the last few days published what purports to be an interview with Paul Glaser, in which he is quoted as saying:

I am urging all the workers I come in contact with to join the A. F. of L. and the I. W. W. I think the I. W. W. principles finally will be injected into the A. F. of L. in this way. The I. W. W. is getting sort of conservative, although many members are drifting back into old ways. The Socialist Party is sure to be replaced by the communists. All this change will be brought about by peaceful methods—the use of the ballot—and there will be no revolution.

Paul Glaser came to the office of Col. Mapes, the commander at Gary, when we first instituted the military control there. He told Col. Mapes how glad he was that the Federal troops were there and how fine it was that they were protecting everybody and that law and order was once more restored. I think there was some arrangement whereby he was going to quarter some of the soldiers in his home. He was the friendliest cuss in that neighborhood, to speak in a slang way.

Now, on Saturday, October 18, the Chicago Socialist carried the following article by Paul Glaser. The heading is "The White Terror in Gary, by Paul P. Glaser, general advisor of the Executive Committee of the Steel Counsel of the city of Gary":

The white terror has arrived in the city of Gary. The authorities got it into action with the coming of the United States troops.

October 6, about 1 o'clock in the morning, 15 policemen, 2 deputy sheriffs, and 1 officer of the War Department broke into my house, raided the same, and after an hour's search the officer carried away with him a booklet written by Jack London, "The Dream of Debs," and a picture of Nicolai Lenine, premier of soviet Russia.

Several other raids have been made. The police broke into the homes of the Socialist locals at 1332 Adams Street and at Fifteenth and Madison Streets and carried away literature and the party membership books.

There was a study class in session at one of the headquarters. Eighteen Socialists, working men and women, trying to get acquainted with the economic problems confronting them, were arrested. I managed to get them all released with the exception of four.

Several of the others were served with deportation warrants by the immigration authorities. They set the bail at \$1,000 and wanted to release them, but Col. Mapes refused. He said there was no reason to round these men up and then release them.

Senator McKELLAR. On what ground did you ask to deport them?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Advocacy of the anarchist movement, openly admitted by the men.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you through with that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. There is another column of this. I do not know whether it is of interest or not.

The capitalist press in Gary is trying to frighten the strikers with the bogey of "Bolshevism," "I. W. W.," "anarchism," and other capitalist "bugaboos." But the strikers are awake to the real nature of this capitalistic rot. In this strike the workers are using their brains instead of their bellies.

I also pointed out to Col. Mapes that at present in the United States there is a movement against the Socialists, with the connivance of the United States Government, which is an historical repetition of what happened in Germany in 1873. Bismarck, in 1873, reported to the Kaiser that the root of Socialism is killed in Germany. Bismarck is dead and buried and forgotten, while Socialism continues to make progress. The same will happen in the United States. The enemies of Socialism will in time be dead, buried, and forgotten, but the advance of Socialism can not be halted, not even by Gen. Wood nor his army.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to ask you a question or two.

(This telegram is sent in to the committee:)

CHICAGO, ILL.

#### STEEL STRIKE INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

Am anxious to know under what law Intelligence Division of Army at Gary operates when it invades homes of nonstrikers at 2 o'clock in the morning, destroys or takes away personal belonging, places its victims in military confinement, then claims to be acting under orders of district attorney at Indianapolis. At Waukegan, arrests are made without warrants, bail set at prohibitive figures, and superintendent of mill consulted before bonds are approved. In both places, immediate trials and hearings are denied. No Red ever outraged law more violently than those minions of the law sworn to serve us under the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution alone will make revolution possible or necessary.

JOHN L. METZEN.

Do you know him?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I never heard his name. I do not know anything about the Waukegan affair. That is outside of our jurisdiction entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no strike on at Waukegan, is there?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. There is a strike in the steel mill up there, but the military had nothing to do with it. I am not acquainted with that at all.

As to the Gary situation, these halls have been entered and papers were confiscated. Your question is as to the operation of the intelligence office in Gary, I believe. That intelligence office was formerly used as a filing room and center for the filing of all these



complaints and records. We have directed to a great extent the efforts of the local police and the efforts of the military. The town is under marshal law, under military control. When a complaint comes in that a man is an anarchist, and has anarchist circulars in his possession, has rifles and ammunition in his home, we never go out on the first complaint. I have never asked anybody to make a search on the first complaint. If that complaint is verified from one or more sources, then troops or policemen have gone to these homes, I believe, and have asked to make a search of the home. We have found considerable quantities of guns and ammunition. One of these radicals that I have just mentioned now—I have forgotten which one it was—had an Austrian rifle with about 400 rounds of ammunition, a shot gun with about 400 rounds of ammunition, and a revolver with several rounds of ammunition. We found them in every place.

The CHAIRMAN. You found them in every place?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In most every place a rifle or a revolver, and that a condition which under military control has to be eliminated, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you about covered the situation now?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; I have not even started it.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, you have not started?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; I can shorten it up, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The only thing is, I am compelled to be on the floor of the Senate a little after 12 o'clock, but you gentlemen can go ahead.

Senator McKELLAR. How long will it take you?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I can finish this up in a couple of hours, I should think.

Senator McKELLAR. If it will take two hours, we had better meet at 2.30 and go at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some witnesses who should be here, and who are here, I think. We have asked them to be here. I asked Mr. Fitzpatrick to send a couple of witnesses here from Gary, and also the steel people to send a couple of witnesses here from Gary.

Are any of these gentlemen here?

(Two witnesses sent by Mr. Fitzpatrick answered that they were present; and it was announced that the witnesses on behalf of the Steel Corporation would be present to-morrow morning.)

Senator McKELLAR. Is the remainder of this testimony along the same lines, as to what you deem important investigations?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. Here is a file on certain branches of the I. W. W. I had 18 one night at my office, and the interrogation lasted until 5.30 o'clock in the morning. It was with reference to the Hungarian Socialist Party, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn now, until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 11.55 a. m., a recess was taken until 2 o'clock p. m. of the same day.)

#### AFTER RECESS.

The committee pursuant to recess.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Phipps, Sterling, Smith, and McKellar.

**TESTIMONY OF LIEUT. DONALD C. VAN BUREN—Resumed.**

Lieut. Donald C. Van Buren resumed the stand and further testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Lieut. Van Buren, you may proceed with your recital.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. We found considerable traces of I. W. W. activity in Gary. I did not go into that this morning. One particular local, which is comparatively new, is the Hungarian local of the I. W. W. in Gary. One night we rounded up 18 members of that particular organization, and I took short statements from each man. It shows the class of foreigners you are dealing with; it shows that the Hungarian is very susceptible to this propaganda, and to a man who can speak his language can get him to do anything whatever, even though they do not know what it is all about. With your permission, I would like to read some of the reports.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no objection to it. Go ahead.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The membership book showing the members to this organization was found under a bathtub in the cellar of one of the officer's homes, at the home of one of the officers.

Senator STERLING. He was a Hungarian?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; all these members are Hungarians. It is exclusively a Hungarian affair. I believe that they are all aliens.

The first, Frank Gilresar, 1353 Jefferson Street, Gary, Ind. Subject stated he joined the I. W. W. last summer in May. He claims he threw away his membership book several weeks ago. Subject is a member of the union and has been out on strike since October 2. Never served on picket duty. He is a single man. Came to the United States in 1907 from Hungary. Has taken out his first papers only. He does not know if he will go back to Hungary or not. Stated he joined the I. W. W. because he thought he could make a better living. He stated that the way the unions were in the Federation of Labor, one union might go out on strike while the other unions of an affiliated nature would stay at work, but under the I. W. W. system all branches of a given industry, such as, for instance, the building trades, including carpenters, bricklayers, etc., would be associated within one big union, and when branch of the industry had a grievance, all branches would strike, thereby at once securing the demands of the injured members. In this way all workers would very much improve their conditions and would control the capitalist class. Subject states he attended the I. W. W. mass meeting. Subject also states that John Sabo is an organizer of the I. W. W., and that he distributes I. W. W. papers. Subject was warned to cease I. W. W. connections and activities and was released. The Gary branch record book, I. W. W., shows that subject was issued, on April 6, book general No. 466799.

Senator STERLING. When was this mass meeting held?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. He does not state exactly.

Senator PHIPPS. Does that probably refer to the mass meetings of May 4?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir. They have secret meetings. This was a separate affair, I believe.

The next is a report on Gus Kiss, 1360 Roosevelt Street, Gary, Ind. Subject stated he joined the I. W. W. three or four months ago. Stated that he had his card at home, that he was a member of the union, and now out on strike; that he was born in Hungary in 1885, and came to the United States in 1910. Subject is single, and has taken out his first papers only. Search of subject's home resulted in finding I. W. W. membership book, general No. 466754, Gustav Kiss, showing dues paid. Referred to immigration authorities. Deportation recommended.

The next is John Belovari, 1536 Van Buren Street, Gary, Ind. Subject stated he joined I. W. W. in April, 1919, and paid \$2 membership dues and three monthly dues. Stated that last month he burned his membership card. Subject is a member of the union and is staying away from work because he became sick. He was born in Hungary in 1884. He came to the United States in 1903. He has his first papers only, which were taken out five or six years ago. Subject is married and lives with his wife at the above address in Gary. He was warned and released.

Let me state that most of these men were specifically told that we had no bone of contention with the American Federation of Labor. I personally told them that if they would stick to the American Federation of Labor and get out of the Russian Federation of Labor they would be much better off.

Senator STERLING. In the testimony of the preceding one, you referred to the matter of referring it to the immigration authorities. What do you mean by that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Copies of this report are being sent to them for their information. I gave copies of this report to the Department of Justice and the immigration authorities.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of any action having been taken by either of those up to date?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I know of no action by the Department of Justice at all. I know that the immigration officials served seven warrants on seven radicals, but I know of no warrants since that time.

The next is George George Maruhnck, 1531 Arthur Place, Gary. Subject stated he joined the I. W. W. in April, as shown by record book of Gary Branch, I. W. W., confirmed by his oral statement. Subject further stated that he joined one night at the request of a friend whose name he could not give, while he was under the influence of liquor. The next morning when he was sober he destroyed his I. W. W. book, card, etc. He came to the United States in 1905. Landed in New York March, 1905, sailing from Hamburg, Germany. Born in Hungary. Subject is married and has three children. He was released with a warning to avoid association with I. W. W., Reds, and avoid reading their literature.

Senator STERLING. Did you make any inquiry as to the particular work being done in the mills by these men, and what wages they received?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They are all common laborers. I did not go into the wage question. I did not think it was within our province.

Senator STERLING. I see.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. We were interested primarily with the radical situation.

The next is Ivan Krapec, 1216 Jefferson Street, Gary, Ind. He would not talk at all. Subject joined the I. W. W., as shown by the record book of the Gary branch record book; was issued general book No. 466442, on May 24, 1919, and dues of \$4 have been paid. Subject denied all knowledge of the I. W. W. and professed ignorance of the subject. He was released pending further investigation.

As I say, he would not talk, and we released him so that we could check him up a little further.

The next is Steven Chernicky, 1360 Roosevelt Street.

Subject joined the I. W. W. four months ago in Gary, Ind. He stated that he had his card at home. He is a member of the union and is out on strike and has served since September 22 as a picket. Subject was born in Hungary in 1887 and came to the United States in 1912. Has taken out his first papers only. Subject is not married. Belongs to the Socialist Party, also No. 8 local, secretary.

Andrew Jambor, 1954 West Fourteenth Avenue. Subject was in the habit of attending Socialist meeting at 1807 Massachusetts Avenue at Socialist Hall; I. W. W. membership book general No. 44687, issued to Steven Chernicky. Recommended for deportation, referred to immigration authorities.

Louis Pirmmerzi, 2459 Jefferson Street. Subject states, "I joined the I. W. W. three months ago. Eight days ago I burned my membership book. All of the members of the I. W. W. branch here decided that the organization is no good and we have just dropped out."

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any reason given for the burning of the books? Did they mean that they reprinted the I. W. W.?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They mean that about the time that troops came in they burned their books. One of them stated that they were warned officially that if the books were found on them they would get into trouble. Subject came to the United States from Hungary in 1913. Has taken out his first papers only, in Chicago, 1913. He is married and has family and lives at the above address in Gary. Worked in the Indiana Steel Co. up to September 22, but is now on strike. He is a member of the union, but says he has not acted as a strike picket. Subject states that his wife is very much opposed to the I. W. W.; record book of the Gary Branch I. W. W. general number 460080 membership book was issued to subject on August 26, 1919, and that dues of \$3.50 were paid by him, bringing his membership up to date. Subject was warned and released.

The next is A. J. Kiss, 1333 Jefferson Street, Gary, Ind. Subject joined the I. W. W. last February. Subject has worked in American Steel & Tin Plate Plant of Gary up until the time of the strike. He is now out on strike. Came from Hungary in 1912. He took out his first papers in 1913. He is married and lives with his family at the above address in Gary. Record book of the Gary Branch I. W. W. shows that general number 466846 membership book was issued to him on April 6, and dues of \$5 have been paid, bringing his membership up to date. Upon being asked to produce his membership card he stated that he had burned the book, as the organization was no good and to hell with it. Upon being questioned he would not state if it was recently or how long ago.

Mrs. Sigmund Beke stated she could not understand why her husband, Sigmund Beke, was held while others of the I. W. W., such

as A. J. Kiss, was released. Upon being questioned as to what she knew of A. J. Kiss, she stated she knew he was a member of the I. W. W. and that he believed in the I. W. W., but she did not know when and where he attended meetings, and she professed ignorance of the matter upon being pressed for facts.

Senator STERLING. Did any of these men give any reasons for not having taken out their second papers, having taken out the first papers many years ago?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Not of this particular branch. These men were very ignorant. The members of this Hungarian branch were very illiterate, and you could not get anything out of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they speak the English language?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Just so that you could understand them.

Andrew Dudas, 2545 Monroe Street, Gary. Subject stated he belonged to the I. W. W. seven or eight months ago in Gary. He was born in Austria-Hungary in 1882 and came to the United States in 1901. Married and has five children. Lives with his family at the above address in Gary. Took out his first papers in Crown Point five years ago. Worked at the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co. until the strike. He is out on strike and belongs to the machinists' union. I. W. W. card and I. W. W. circulars attached were found in subject's possession. He is a subscriber to the I. W. W. paper, "Emancipation." Subject states that Sabo—previously referred to—gets these papers in a bundle and distributes them to all the members. Subject has a union picket emblem in his possession. Record book of the Gary branch of the I. W. W. shows that general number 466488 membership book was issued to subject on April 6 and that dues of \$3.50 paid by him. Subject was warned and released.

Joe Davek, 2516 Grand Avenue. Subject states that he joined the I. W. W. last April, and that he is still a member in good standing. He has a home and one child. Came to the United States from Hungary in 1913. He has taken out first papers only. Worked at the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co. up until the strike. He is now out on strike. He has served as a union picket. Attached was a picket badge and I. W. W. book No. 466796. Subject was warned and released.

John Dudas, 2522 Monroe Street, Gary. Subject states that he joined I. W. W. in May. That he attended I. W. W. meeting at Fourteenth and Washington Streets last spring and paid \$2.50 to join. He has a wife and one child and is living in Gary at the above address. He subscribes to the I. W. W. paper "Emancipation." Subject states that these papers come in a package and are distributed at Eighteenth and Massachusetts Streets, at the meeting hall. Subject states that Joachian Ferenz is secretary of the local branch, I. W. W. Subject received Army notification 22860. He is a Hungarian. Received notice of I. W. W. branch meeting in September. Was found in subject's possession I. W. W. literature also. He was born in Hungary in 1892. Came to the United States in 1909. He has taken out no citizenship papers at all. Record book of Gary branch, I. W. W., shows that general No. 466489 membership book was issued to subject on 6th of April and dues of \$4.50 have been paid. It is recommended that this case be referred to the immigration authorities.

John Piskowicz, 2541 Monroe Street. Subject states he joined the I. W. W. five months ago. That he joined at the request of a friend. On being questioned as to the name of that friend, he admitted he could not remember his name. He stated that he would meet the friend on the street when he was walking to work. Subject is a member of the blacksmiths' union. He was born in Hungary; came to the United States 16 years ago. Had taken out his first papers; never took out his second papers. Is married and has one child and lives in Gary at the above address. Worked at the Tin Plate plant, but went on strike. Admits reading I. W. W. paper "Emancipation." He subscribed 50 cents for this paper. Subject further states that these papers were brought in in a bundle to the meeting hall at 1807 Massachusetts Street and distributed to the members there by Secretary Sabo. Record book of Gary branch, I. W. W., 466495 was issued to the subject, June 15, 1919, and that \$3 in dues were paid by him. When asked for his book, subject laughed and stated that his wife was mad at him for joining the organization, and that it was no good, and several days ago she burned up his card. Subject was warned and released.

Mike Kern, 2231 Adams Street, Gary, Ind. Subject states he is a member of the International Union of Machinists—that is a branch of the American Federation of Labor. Is married and has wife and children living at the above address. Being questioned as to his I. W. W. membership book, subject stated that this book belonged to his wife. He was born in Hungary in 1879, and came to the United States in 1908. His first papers were taken out five years ago in New Orleans. Subject had I. W. W. book No. 466145 in his possession. He admitted having subscribed to the I. W. W. paper "Emancipation," and stated that the papers came to Sabo, secretary, from Chicago, and that he (Sabo) distributed the papers to the members. Sergt. Brien went to bring the subject in for examination at 12.45 a. m. The light was on in the subject's house, and after the sergeant entered the subject turned out the light. Record book of I. W. W., Gary branch, shows that No. 466145 membership book was issued to Mike Kern July 4 and that dues of \$3 had been paid. Subject held for examination, but subsequently released.

Senator STERLING. What does this I. W. W. membership book consist of?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I had one here this morning, sir, as an exhibit.

Steve Paul (Istvan), 931 Jefferson Street, Gary, Ind. Subject states, "I joined I. W. W. three months ago in Cleveland. The meeting place was Hungarian home, about three blocks from Buckeye Road." Subject did not know how many members there were in I. W. W. lodge in Cleveland. States that Katora told him that the I. W. W. was the workers' one big union and that by joining this organization workingmen would get all their demands and live an easy life. Subject further stated, when asked for his membership book, that he heard the I. W. W. union was a bad union and that the Government authorities were after them, so he tore up his book several days ago. He was born in Hungary, 1881; came to the United States in 1901. Never took out citizenship papers. Anxious to go back to the old country not later than next spring. Record book of I. W. W., Gary branch, shows that general No. 465795

membership book was issued to subject and that subject transferred from Cleveland local 300, I. W. W., July 26 and that \$2 dues were paid by subject on July 26. Subject was warned and released.

Senator STERLING. Did many of these men, Lieutenant, concede that they had joined the I. W. W. in ignorance of the facts, and if they had known the facts they would not have joined?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That was the substance of the plea; yes, sir. Most of those men which I have indicated as warned and released were very ignorant. They did not know anything about it when they were requested to join it, so they claim. They knew that somebody had gotten \$2.50 from them and that they joined one big union; that it was the proper thing, and that they had given them their money.

Senator PHIPPS. And they were all members of the American Federation of Labor—were they not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And they practically all read "Emancipation" and I. W. W. literature?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they seem to know what the American Federation of Labor was?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No; not particularly. They thought it was a union that was in good standing, for some reason or other, and that the I. W. W. was not.

Senator McKELLAR. Could they read these periodicals if they were in English?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. The periodicals had to be published in their own language?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. I do not believe that there was one man in the crowd that could read or write the English language.

Senator STERLING. And this "Emancipation," was that printed in the English language?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; it was printed in the Hungarian language.

Senator SMITH. Did it go into the mails at all, so far as you can judge?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; not so far as I can judge. I am informed that they are now sending their publications either by courier or through express in bundles marked "Cigars," or something of that kind, and get by without any suspicion, and those papers go to the Secretary, and he takes the papers out and distributes them himself.

Senator STERLING. Did you find where any of them took a paper called the "Rebel Worker?"

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No; not this particular crowd. I found several of those papers among the people. I remember of seeing it.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe you said this morning that some of that literature was found in the headquarters and in the houses?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. I believe I can say that I have not seen a bit of real American literature during the whole investigation in Gary.

These reports on this particular group run along about the same way. I can give the names if you want them. I believe that there

are 24 that we secured in this group. Every man is an alien and admits that he joined the I. W. W. at some time or other, and most of them had their membership I. W. W. cards and the union cards together in the same pocket, and in some instances they had a picket badge along with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they all strikers—this group?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Practically every man.

Senator SMITH. And they were all reading these foreign papers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; they read nothing else, sir.

Senator SMITH. Were you able to have any of those papers translated?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Some of them. I had a man who could read and speak Hungarian and who could read and speak Russian out there. The bulk of the foreign literature is published either in Russian or Hungarian. It takes a great deal of time to do this. It is going to take us a year probably to translate the records of meetings and the names and addresses. It runs all over the world.

Senator SMITH. The question I had especially in view was to find out the advice given them in these publications. If they had been translated, we could find out the character of the advice that was being given to these people through these publications.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Some of them have been. Those were publications in Russian. I submitted a memorandum which is given by an agent who speaks Russian, a brief synopsis of what the book was about, whether it was anarchistic, and so on, and what I characterized this morning as the "Red Bible," is the manifesto of the Third International of Moscow. That was held in the spring of this year. That preaches open revolution to the workmen of all nations; the overthrow of all government under one dictator.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that printed in Philadelphia?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. And that dictator was supposed to be Lenine and Trotski. The particular pamphlet that I had was printed by the German Publishing House in Chicago. That can be had at almost any news stand that handles those socialistic periodicals.

Senator SMITH. And it preaches open resort to force to bring about a revolution?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Have any steps been taken to suppress that publication?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. None to my knowledge at all; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And has it been brought to the attention of the Department of Justice?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. The Department of Justice has all of that literature. They had everything we have and a great deal more besides, I believe. They must have it. Here is a sample of an I. W. W. circular. This was picked up and translated.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was it picked up?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. It was picked up in one of the homes of one of these men. It was a mimeographed circular. This is as the Hungarian translated it:

*The Metal and Machine Workers, 300th Hungarian Group, Gary, Ind.*

ESTEEMED WORKER: This is to your kind attention, that on September 27, 1919, Saturday evening, at 7 p. m. o'clock, at the Workers' Home, 1807 Massachusetts Street, a very important members' meeting will be held.



Such very important matters are on program that every member has to be present.

You became a member of our movement, the I. W. W. You joined the Industrial Workers of the World. We have to show our class pledge, and have to appear promptly at our meetings, if you don't want to remain always an obedient servant to the capitalist class, which class puts the best of us in prison, lynch our bravest, and are holding over our heads the whip of hunger.

Do not remain a small-hearted, saving worker. You should be a man, self-possessed, brave, heroic, fighting proletar. Not simply work for the workers and their cause. Read our paper "The Resurrection," spread our literature. Obtain new members and bring them to our meetings.

We have to-day two kinds of workers. Obedient hearted, who kisses his master's sole, who kicks him—and the self-possessed true worker, who is ready to do everything for his class. To which do you belong? Your actions will show this.

Act and appear at our meetings.

With workers' greetings.

THE METAL AND MACHINE WORKERS,  
300th Hungarian Group, belonging to I. W. W.

This is just an ordinary circular. Now, there are about 24 of those reports.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not seem to me—you have grouped them together?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Those 24, you say, are about the same. Are they all Hungarian locals?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That is the Hungarian local; yes, sir.

Here is a rather interesting report on our late friend, pro-Germanism. It was found in Gary. There is a club at Gary called the Saxon Verein. It meets in what is called the Saxon Hall. A couple of sergeants got on to that place and they went in there and they found on the wall an enormous silk German flag.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That was about a week or so ago. The report is dated October 14. Col. Mapes said that he never saw in Berlin or Coblenz a German flag equal in quality to the one that was hanging on the wall of the Saxon club in Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it permitted to stay there?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir. On the wall of that particular organization was found a communication from what is called the German-American Citizens Local, main office in Chicago, Dr. H. Gerhard, 2926 Berlin Street, secretary. In other words, this organization was a local of the German-American Citizens League. I happened to know a little about that organization in Chicago. It has come into prominence since the starting of the armistice, and according to Dr. Gerhard's own statement, it has now a membership of between seven and eight thousand Germans in Chicago. He has expressed it, given it as his opinion, that they have locals extending all over the Middle West at the present time as far west as Colorado; that the purpose of that German-American Citizens League, stated in their constitution, printed in German, is about as follows:

To perpetuate the German kultur in the United States of America. That organization is flourishing at the present time.

Senator STERLING. Was it represented that it was to take the place, to some extent, of the German National Alliance?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. All of the officers of the German-American Citizens League were mixed up with the Alliance during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that organization formed?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not know. It came to our attention shortly after the signing of the armistice.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; I do not, not when this particular organization was formed. They are conducting a propaganda at the present time in an attempt to get together the old crew. Dr. Gerhard made a statement to a man in whom I have absolute confidence, who reported to my office, that he had fought duels in Germany while he attended the university in Germany. His face, as a matter of fact, is scarred up considerably, and that he had a couple of gunshot wounds in his body. He is getting to be an old man, rather feeble and old, but that he stated he could kill any Englishman who lived if an opportunity ever presented itself.

Senator STERLING. Was Dr. Gerhard a member or an officer of the German-American Alliance?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. He was identified with it. I do not know just what his connection was.

The Department of Justice should have all those names. They are interwoven. This letterhead from that Chicago organization, which was confined to Gary, has a list of names—as a matter of fact that is not attached—but it gives a list of probably 20 or 30 men who were prominently identified with the German Socialists during the war.

I might state that this caretaker resented the taking down of this German flag. There were two small American flags beside it, just enough to make them ridiculous. This big silk German flag, and then two small American flags beside it. This caretaker remarked to the sergeant, "Why don't you take your American flags, too, and get out?" The sergeant told him if he opened his trap again he would run him through with a bayonet. The sergeant had been in Germany.

Senator STERLING. Did they carry away that German flag as a trophy?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; it is in the headquarters of the Fourth Provisional Regiment in Gary.

Senator STERLING. That is where I thought it ought to be.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In that organization was also found a great deal of Socialistic literature printed in German. It was the same line of stuff we have seen this morning, only printed in German—anti-militarism and all that sort of stuff. I remember one pamphlet that had a picture of the working man lying on the ground, his hand outstretched. There was a soldier standing over him, and the soldier had thrust his bayonet down through this man's hand, holding him to the ground. I have forgotten the title of the picture, but it was obvious what it was meant to convey.

The CHAIRMAN. Did this organization in any way figure in the strike out there?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Some of the members were in the strike; yes, sir. I do not know that any of them were identified in any official capacity with the American Federation of Labor. I do not believe they were. But some of the men were working in the mills. The mills is about the only industry in Gary for the common laboring man.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. The question is, do you think as an organization they went into the strike, or did they simply go in as individuals?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I can answer that in this way, sir. Anything which would promote an anti-American movement, through any sort of radicalism, I believe the German-American Citizens League was in on it. If they could get in with the radical crowd in the American Federation of Labor they would probably bear with all the influence they had at their command.

The CHAIRMAN. You are giving that only as your opinion?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That is my opinion; yes, sir.

Our investigation is still continuing, was when I left, as to the personnel of this organization and just exactly what they were doing, and who they were in Gary.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. What evidence did you have to lead you to that conclusion?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That mass of socialistic literature found there, for one thing.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. This Gary literature?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; printed in German, the same sort of socialistic Red stuff was found in Russian and Hungarian, printed in German. One of their papers had that cartoon I have just described on it, a German paper.

The CHAIRMAN. Those German papers that you speak of, were they printed in this country?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I believe they were, sir. I think most of them were printed in Chicago. As far as I know we have not seen a single Hungarian or German paper printed outside of this country.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. What, in your judgment, is the amount of production going on now in the steel mills at Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I have been reliably informed that the large plants in Gary are operating to-day between 50 and 60 per cent of their normal capacity. Some of the small plants are operating very near normal. The condition in South Chicago, which is outside of the military zone, is not so favorable. The reports indicate a return every day of anywhere from one to two or three hundred additional workmen. When a plant employs, six, eight, or ten thousand men, it takes a long time to make an impression, I suppose.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any more reports there?

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Are they just along the same line?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Just along one line.

This report of the Hungarian Socialistic Association, that is a translation of a song found in the Hungarian Socialistic headquarters in Gary. It runs along about as follows:

Up, up, you slaves of the earth;  
Up, you hungry Proletariat.  
The conditions of victory are coming,  
Which will end our slavery;  
This battle will be our last.  
Just hold together and we will become International.  
This battle will be our last.

And so on.

Senator PHIPPS. This is not the same headquarters you reported on, where there were found the names of the 24 men?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. That is a separate organization?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. These are separate branches.

Senator STERLING. This is called what?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The Hungarian Socialist Party; or Federation. There is the Hungarian I. W. W. Sometimes they belong to both of them.

Now, in a regular book, found in the Hungarian Socialist Federation, there are a great many names. Our investigation is continuing on most of these. It is interesting, however, that the name of Oscar E. Anderson, of 1699 Tenth Street, heads the list. Oscar E. Anderson, I believe, was president of the Trades Union organized in Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the list you had, do you say?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A list of members of this Hungarian Socialistic organization or federation.

Under the heading "The Chairman" appears two names. One is Dimitre Economoff. I considered his case this morning. Then appears again the name of Oscar E. Anderson. Three men out of this organization were recommended for deportation, and warrants were received by the immigration authorities.

Senator STERLING. Have they taken out their first papers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. I did not hear the last part of your statement. They were recommended for deportation, and what else?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. And upon examination of the immigration authorities at Chicago, warrants were refused.

Senator PHIPPS. The immigration authorities took no action?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. They took action, and refused to report?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. They took adverse action?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You say they were recommended for deportation?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. By our officer upon evidence at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Then they had a hearing?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the authorities refused deportation?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this all put before them?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How long had these men been here whose deportation was recommended by your office?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Those three men, John Fogarsy, Sigmund Beke, and John Rozza.

Senator STERLING. Of what nationality?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I believe all were Hungarians, sir. Maybe I can find statements of those particular men.

Sigmund Beke stated that he was born in Hungary and came to this country in 1907. He has worked at West Pullman, Ill., and Indiana Harbor, and came to Gary in 1909. Took out his first papers several years ago. Is married and owns a home. Has been

a member of the Hungarian Socialist Party since 1912. Socialist, Bolshevik, and I. W. W. literature were found in his possession.

The CHAIRMAN. Was any decision filed in these cases by the board of officers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They returned the reports on these three men to the office in Gary and a letter, which I have not a copy of, unfortunately, issued as follows:

It is our opinion, upon examination of the evidence, that these three men are not fit subjects for deportation.

They call attention to the law under which they had to operate, and state that an absolute statement from the man of a direct anarchistic or revolutionary nature must be shown; or that it must be shown beyond question of a doubt that he is an anarchist.

Under that ruling it practically means that you have got to get a man with a lighted bomb in his hand putting it under somebody's house and make him sign a confession that he did it and have it sworn to.

Senator STERLING. Who was at the head of the Immigration Service at Chicago?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A man by the name of Landis—not Judge Landis; another commissioner.

Senator STERLING. Is his decision final?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Or does it go to the Commissioner of Immigration?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Of course, when we go through that channel, it stops there. We have no means of going over his head. I did take these cases up with the Department of Justice agent, requesting that he take it up with his bureau, with somebody in Washington, to see if we could get some action. What was done, I do not know. The case is really pending from that other standpoint.

I also took up the cases of the two officers of the I. W. W. organization, this man Sanbro, who distributed the literature, and the secretary, who was one of the organizers, and referred them to the immigration officials. They had not taken any definite action on those two cases up to the time I left Gary, which was three or four days ago. What has been done in the meantime, I do not know.

But they are the organizers and promoters of that sort of business and all aliens.

Here is the first preliminary report on this man John Fogarsy. His name also appeared in the membership book of the I. W. W. He says he was born in Hungary, came to this country in 1905; landed at New York and left from the city of Fiume. Worked at Martin's Ferry, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Annapolis, Md.; and has been in Gary eight years. He is a barber, single, and owns no property. Says he is a subscriber and reads the Elore. That is an I. W. W. paper, a Hungarian paper.

Senator STERLING. Published where?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I believe in New York City; I am not positive of that, but I think that is a New York publication.

He says he reads I. W. W. literature sent to him, also belongs to the communist party. That is the new organization, which was reorganized in September in Chicago, an outgrowth of the old left

wing of the ultraradical socialistic group. They split up in September in their conference in Chicago and organized a communist party, or the Communist Labor Party.

The minutes of those two organizations, a manifesto, and the program are very similar to the manifesto of the Third International, both of them.

I believe they sent a telegraph or cable greeting to Lenin and Trotsky when they were organized, or something of that sort.

The book containing the list of the members of the old English organization, that has gone out of existence, as I understand, shows the name of Oscar E. Anderson as a member.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. The bulk of these revolutionists are aliens, are they not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Therefore entirely within the reach of Congress?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are their leaders largely American?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. As I said before, I have not found during this current investigation into the radicals a single man, a leader or member or organizer of any of these organizations, who was an American-born citizen. The leaders have been clever enough to complete their naturalization, but there is a way to get their citizenship papers canceled. That is a matter for the United States attorney to handle, I understand. There has to be a hearing on that. But a man who is an alien and engaged in this sort of activity can be deported without any hearing, I believe, except what the immigration authorities decide to give him.

Senator STERLING. No court proceedings are necessary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No court proceedings are necessary at all; no, sir.

Here is a report of the Bolshevik meeting of October 9. The soldiers brought in quite a few of these men for deportation. Out of this number the immigration authorities selected seven and served warrants on them. That is the only time any specific action has been taken to my knowledge. This report is rather interesting. It shows the Russian type, as contrasted with the Hungarian. The Russian is a little smarter. An agent of the Bureau of Investigation aided in the interrogation. I sat in myself. Two of us did most of this. The report is as follows:

Nick Serguch, Russian, 764 Washington Street, laborer. Wife in old country. Is 27 years old. Came to Canada first and to United States three years ago. Did not go through immigration channels, and did not pay head tax. Believed to be subject to deportation on this ground alone. Also admits he is a member of the first Russian Bolshevik organization and has no papers. Was drafted into United States Army, but was discharged because he had no papers. Held for deportation.

Steve Denudkvilz, Russian, 1528 Jackson Street, 31 years old. Wife and child in Russia. Six years in United States. Has no citizenship papers. Believes in United States form of government, and states he was merely an on-looker at the Bolshevik meeting, and not a member of the party. Released.

Daniel Melnichenko, Russian, 65 Eleventh Avenue; married; has four children in the old country; 44 years old. Member of the Russian branch of Bolshevik. Believes in communism. Wants to go back to Russia. Believes in the overthrow of the United States Government, by force and violence, if necessary. Held for immigration authorities.

Mike Sereda, Russian, 1238 Adams Street. Wife and two children living with him in Gary. Seven years in the United States. Filed declaration of intention several months ago. Belonged to Russian Bolshevik Party until three months ago; but was injured in the mill and received no assistance from his society, so he quit them. Believes in United States Government. Is not an advocate of the Soviet. Expects to stay and live in the United States. Released.

Sam Yakamuk, Russian, 1334 Adams Street. Single. Six years in United States. No papers. Member of First Russian Branch Bolshevik Party. Is a distributor of Bolshevik literature in Gary and admits it. Had letter in his possession which advised his friends not to take out their citizenship papers—"If you do you will be taken as a soldier." Class 5 in draft. Admits he was arrested during the war for not filling his questionnaire. Letter in his possession which stated there were 170 members in his particular Bolshevik organization in Gary. Held for immigration authorities.

Erasim Koleda, Russian, 1624 Massachusetts Avenue. Wife in Russia. Six years in United States; three in Gary. No citizenship papers. Can not read or write. Very ignorant. Released.

S. Koslovich, Russian, 1633 Maryland Street. Belongs to Socialist Party. Eight years in United States; three in Gary. States that one Nick Serguch is the secretary of the Gary Bolshevik organization, and that one Boresouko is the treasurer. Says he is going back to work. Gave additional information that Vladimir Lossieff, alleged anarchist, was in Gary last week and made a speech to the local Bolshevik organization. Subject released with warning.

William Brusko, Russian, 1967 Connecticut Street. Single. In United States eight years. Completed naturalization while serving in the United States Army. Attended meeting as a casual bystander. Does not belong to the party. Released.

Alex Pastrick, Russian, 1621 Jackson Street. One leg off. Says he has no regular work. Has been in the United States eight years. Is single. Was arrested May 4, during the May-Day demonstration in Gary. Belongs to the old Socialist Party; does not pay any more dues, however. Quit the Socialist Party two months ago, after he was arrested. Wants to stay in the United States. Says he has not the money to take out naturalization papers. Ordered to return to-morrow morning, at which time he will be furnished \$1 to pay for first papers. Says he merely happened in at the meeting.

Stephan Stravolto, Russian, 1947 Pennsylvania; single; came to the United States six and a half years ago; 31 years old; no papers. Says he is a member of the First Branch Russian Communist Party. Has belonged for one year. Believes in the Soviet form of government; says it should be established in United States. Frankly admits he is in favor of the overthrow of this Government to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Held for immigration authorities.

Aefenasy Nastrovich, Russian, 1332 Adams Street; came to United States six years ago; 38 years of age; no papers. Married; wife in Russia. Is a Socialist; member of First Branch Russian Bolshevik. Can not read or write. Says Serguch is the secretary of the first branch. Also arrested and held for immigration authorities.

Fred Koval, Russian, home in Chicago, came to Gary to get some back pay. Chicago address, 1237 Sangamon Street. Came to United States four years ago from Canada, where he resided four years. Has taken out first papers in Chicago. States he was a passerby, and merely happened in at the meeting to see what was going on. Released.

Vasily Sellacoff, Russian, 1621 Jackson. Laborer. Single. Came to United States four years ago; came direct to Gary. Says he is not a Red or a Socialist. Very ignorant; can not read or write. Released.

Senator McKellar. Why does not this first man you mentioned go back?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I think he was served with a warrant also. He will not have any discretion in the matter, I believe, now, unless released for some reason or other.

Under Anton Garbuz the Department of Justice made a note that he believes this is the man who was attempting to organize the Russian Red Guard in Gary early last summer. There was such a movement there.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. What did they understand there by the "Russian Red Guard"?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A military outfit. They were to get some returned soldiers interested in taking over their membership and drilling them, and ultimately drilling them with guns and ammunition.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. To do what?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. So when the revolution came they would be prepared for it. They would become the communist Red army, the same as in Russia.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. For the forceful overthrow of Government?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir; that is it.

Senator STERLING. I suppose there are enough Russians there to make a formidable army, probably?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The impression I received since I have been working in Gary is just as if you had a small American colony in Petrograd or Moscow. You are up against the same proposition exactly. They outnumber you; not only two to one, but possibly eight or nine to one.

Senator McKELLAR. The Russians outnumber?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The Russians and Hungarians. There are very few real Americans.

Senator McKELLAR. What proportion would you say?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I suggested eight or nine to one.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. What proportion of the Russians, as a result of your investigation, do you think were advocates of forceful revolution?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I have not found one, sir, who would not admit that he was a member, at least, of the Social branch. You put the direct question to him, "Do you believe in mass action?"—that is one of their favorite phrases—"Do you believe in direct action?" And they will generally hedge a little bit. They will say, "No; I don't believe in using firearms; but I believe in calling a general strike, if necessary. Primarily, I believe in the use of the ballot." The ballot is of no use to them because they are not citizens. They believe in revolution.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. If 10 per cent of the worst of these men were thinned out and shipped off, would that have a wholesome effect?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Absolutely. I believe, sir, the great majority of these men are exploited by organizers and agitators. I have a considerable pity for them.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Agitators and organizers are aliens also?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Not always; no, sir.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Are a considerable number of them aliens?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. If we shipped all the alien agitators and organizers out of the country—

Lieut. VAN BUREN (interposing). There would be no more trouble at all.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Would that help the situation?



Lieut. VAN BUREN. Absolutely. Then our problem would be to educate these men along American lines.

The CHAIRMAN. How did all these foreigners get here? How did they happen to be there? Do you know?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In Gary?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Gary is a mill town. There is no other industry there but the steel mills. I suppose they have come in as common laborers, about the only form of work they could do. They have received good pay during the war. The only other business enterprise of any sort in Gary is the picture shows and stores and organizations of that class. There is no other mill or enterprise I know of except what there are as a branch of the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator McKELLAR. How did all of these people get into this country, do you know?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir. Some of these men came in through Canada without going through the immigration authorities.

Senator STERLING. Did you get the impression that these leaders or agitators were ready to resort to force if they could not accomplish this revolution, this industrial revolution, by peaceable means?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A leader or agitator would like to get it going and then step out. He would get behind the men doing the work for him.

As an illustration of that, take this parade, on the Sunday when the demonstration was held, contrary to the orders of the mayor. I am informed that a man named Leverman—he is one of the Reds in that city; he owns a drug store; he was one of the organizers of that demonstration; he very bravely stood at the front of it, so he would have his picture taken; but as soon as the parade started he backed out and left it, and you could not find him after they went down the street.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Do you understand that these Reds are advising the rank and file to get ready to resort to force, if necessary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They advise them in this way. They advise them that they had better prepare to take over the reins of Government; that the time is coming when they are going to be the majority; that it is going to be up to them to assume the management of these big industries; and these very Socialistic schools and so on talk nothing but that, and they talk freely of a revolution, but they always qualify it in this way: they believe in political or an industrial revolution. Of course that manifesto of the Third International comes out openly for a revolution with bloodshed if necessary; and that is the book that they all read.

Senator PHIPPS. But have you questioned a number of these men to learn what their reasons are for being on strike? Were they dissatisfied with conditions?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Some of them told me their stories. The chief reason that was given was the number of hours.

The CHAIRMAN. What did they say about that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Well, a man told me—one of the strikers told me he did not have enough time to barely get acquainted with his family; that he was working so many hours during the day—I have forgotten whether 10 or 12—and when he came home he was tired

and had to go to bed; and he was working every other Sunday, so that left him very little time at home to attend to anything else.

That, I believe, was the principal reason. I do not recall I ever heard a complaint as to wages or treatment. It was principally on the length of time they were employed in the mills.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that complaint as to length of time pretty general?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That was about the only complaint I did hear.

Senator McKELLAR. Did they complain of not having wages enough?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I never heard that complaint; no.

The CHAIRMAN. They got 42 cents an hour—the unskilled laborers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Most of those men are getting more money than I am.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Suppose it was reduced to an eight-hour day at the same price?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That is where the trouble is coming in, of course. Some of them think they ought to get the same pay for the eight-hour work. I remember one or two instances of these men that had large families, who made the statement that they would just as soon work for eight hours at a reduced wage, if that could be made universal—the universal period of work.

The CHAIRMAN. They want an eight-hour day?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. They do have a basic eight-hour day, with time and a half for overtime, do they not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not know. I have not gone into that question at all, except as a side issue, on the Red propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not been investigating the strike?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Absolutely in no way, shape, or manner, except as it came in contact with the activities of the radicals.

The CHAIRMAN. There are other witnesses here who will testify as to the strike.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Who have made that investigation? What is your suggestion of a remedy? You ought to be able to give a very broad and intelligent one.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In my humble opinion, sir, my suggestion would be the curbing in some way or other of the American-born citizen who is engaging in this activity. There are a few I know of. They have not been in Gary. Those men will either have to be made to shut up or be locked up, one or the other. That is the answer to that end of it.

Senator McKELLAR. How would it do to pass a law punishing by imprisonment and fine every American citizen who belongs to one of these radical societies; and I mean by that the societies like the anarchists' societies and the I. W. W. societies, or who sends out literature of such societies, and have the punishment fixed so that we might take care of them in this way: If they did not want to suffer the penalty, to give them the option of taking 10 years and \$5,000 fine or be sent to an island in the Philippine Archipelago, where they can carry out their peculiar bent of mind in a way that would be interesting to them only?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In other words, establish a soviet on the island?

Senator McKellar. If they wish. It occurs to me that would be a very good plan. What do you think of it?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Excellent, sir.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. It might be all right if you could cut off all means of communication between them and the rest of the islands?

Senator McKellar. They would have to be under guard, of course. Now, as to those who are aliens: How would it do to provide that they must become citizens within five years from the time they come here, not permitting them to become citizens until after they have been here three years? Those who have already been here longer than five years, give them two years in which to become citizens, and require them to speak the English language in those two years before they can become citizens, and deporting them unless they do learn to speak the English language and unless they are able to qualify.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That will, of course, prevent their gathering together funds and returning to the old country, which a great many of them plan on doing.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. Ought not a number of them be sent out at once, the leaders deported at once?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That would immediately settle the problem. If the leaders could be handled, the great mass of these people are really simply so ignorant they do not understand what it is all about.

Senator SMITH of Georgia. I want to say that this committee reported favorably, two or three days ago, a bill to appropriate twelve and one-half million dollars every year toward teaching aliens English—foreigners English—giving them to chance to fit themselves to be American citizens.

Senator McKellar. The trouble that you speak of the Department of Justice, I happen to have looked into that matter rather carefully the last few days. The trouble is that we have got a very liberal provision in our Constitution about the freedom of the press and freedom of speech, and now there is no adequate law on our statute books to deal with what is generally known as the Reds. A law can be passed that will be perfectly constitutional along the lines I suggested a moment ago, and I believe with the passage of such a law we can easily dispose of the Red question in this country, and it ought to be done as soon as possible. Does that idea meet your approval?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not mean, of course, to argue for an eight-hour day?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. And, adopting Senator McKellar's idea of sending them to the Philippine Islands, do you not think we ought to consult the Filipinos about that?

Senator McKellar. I mean send them to an island with all the Filipinos off. We would not do anything so unjust to the Filipinos as to associate them with those fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything further?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. In the Senator's enumeration of the radical societies, he must have forgotten the two new communistic societies, the Communistic Party of America and the Communistic Labor

Party of America, both with headquarters in Chicago. They are just as radical as anything we have in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they composed of American citizens?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. One of the leaders is a man named Rothenberg, formerly of Cleveland, I believe, and was born in this country. He has served a sentence during the war as a slacker for refusing to register; and had been an agitator before, and has been agitating ever since. He is now out, I believe, on a \$20,000 bond, on some charge or other.

Senator McKELLAR. What is his full name?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. C. E. Rothenberg.

Senator McKELLAR. That law, if we prepare it, ought to take care of these men that print these books and periodicals you brought here.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The printer of the Russian propaganda, in my opinion, is the Lutwig-Martens Bureau, of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that among many of these men there is good material for American citizenship, if they understood or had any way of understanding what the ideals and purposes of America were?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you not think it ought to be the business of the Government and the States to try to get those ideas into the minds of these men and give them a chance to be American citizens; and that if they will not be good American citizens, let them get out?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That is the difficulty. They are uneducated and uninformed at the present time. They are easy prey for these leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not know what they are doing, a lot of them, do they?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No, sir; they do not.

The CHAIRMAN. So that there is some responsibility upon the State governments and upon the Congress and upon everybody else for this situation, and upon those who have been instrumental in bringing these men into the country?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you some more records there you wish to submit?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Of course, this is all along the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us any idea, any estimate, of the number of men who are similar in their ideas to what you have given us?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. When I left Gary we had a file of about 200 separate cases. Some of those files, where we had attempted to copy the list of members from membership books, included names up as high as seven or eight hundred, and it was a job of sifting out the good and the bad from that sort of a mess, which would take months. I have given one of the copies of those reports to the Department of Justice, and asked them to go to it.

Senator STERLING. The membership books were books in the various locals there?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. The I. W. W. and other radical societies?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. The South Slavic Federation, various socialistic branches, the First and Second Russian Branches, a Russian Communistic Society, this one I. W. W., the Hungarian I. W. W., and, of course, there are a great many members of the I. W. W. in there who belong to the Chicago outfit direct. We ran across traces of the men like Bill Haywood, Rothenberg, Lutwig-Martens, and their lieutenants. If they were handled immediately this thing would be over, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. Haywood is under penitentiary sentence now, is he not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. But he is in Chicago directing operations of the I. W. W.

The CHAIRMAN. He is now?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of these other men you have mentioned defendants in those Chicago cases?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No; Martens is in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. What is he?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I don't know whether he is a Russian. I have heard he is a German. I am not sure as to that. I am simply repeating rumor on that matter, what I have heard. He has been under investigation for some time, I think, by the Department of Justice, Ludwig and Martens.

Senator PHIPPS. What other men did you mention?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The Ludwig-Martens Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Martens a representative of the Bolshevik government?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. That is what he calls himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether he has any credentials as such?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not know as to that. I never saw them.

Senator STERLING. Haywood's case and the case of the other I. W. W.'s convicted at the same time is pending on appeal, is it not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; he is out pending appeal. Now, matters of this sort—here is a batch of distributors of Bolshevik literature: In Indiana Harbor, 5; in Whiting, Ind., 6 names; Gary, Ind.—2 of these have been recommended for deportation; Milwaukee, Wis., 6 names; East Hammond, 7 names. And matters of that kind, I am giving that to the Department of Justice as fast as we get it.

Senator STERLING. What is the character of the literature they are distributing?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The same as I have given.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find anything to connect up Haywood in any way with any of the activities in Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I have a report here, but I have not had a chance to verify it. Therefore I hesitate about giving an unverified report; but the man is in the room and can make his own defense. I have had it in mind to talk to him, but have not had a chance to do so. I will give it for what it is worth, and I do not vouch for it. It is simply a preliminary report.

Senator SMITH. Who is the man?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Oscar Anderson, the president of the Steel Workers in Gary. We have a report in which it is stated that an

official of the I. W. W.'s in Chicago made this remark concerning Oscar Anderson some time ago. He stated that Oscar Anderson is the most active representative of and worker for the I. W. W. in Gary. He characterized Anderson as his chief organizer in that town.

Senator SMITH. Who did that?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. An official of the I. W. W. in Chicago, according to the conversation that was reported to our office. That is the way these preliminary reports are made.

Senator STERLING. You have not followed that up yourself?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. No. I expected to talk to Anderson myself in Gary, but came away several days ago and did not get the information. His name has appeared in two Socialist records definitely, one the Hungarian Socialists, and also the English Socialists, and he was also named as chairman in one of those record books.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything more, Lieutenant?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. One thing. This is a part of the activities of the Communist Society of Chicago. After the troops moved to Gary we found circulars in Gary which were being spread broadcast, and this is one of the circulars. It is addressed as follows:

The capitalists challenge you, workingmen!

This is a proclamation of the Communist Party of America. It reads as follows:

Martial law has been declared in Gary, Ind.

Soldiers of the Regular Army, soldiers who have seen service overseas, who have waded through the blood of their fellows on the battle fields of Europe, as the capitalist press is gloatingly declaring, are now in control.

The army of occupation entered Gary fully equipped. Automatic rifles, hand grenades, machine guns, and heavier cannon, cannon that can clear 2 miles of a city street in a few minutes, as the officer in charge said—these are ready for use in Gary. And the soldiers wear trench helmets made by the workers of Gary!

Why are these soldiers there, workingmen of the United States? What has happened in the City of Steel that requires this murderous equipment for the destruction of human lives?

The workingmen of Gary are engaged in a struggle against the capitalists. They have suffered long. Low wages, long hours of exhausting work in the heat of the steel ovens, life-sapping toil with no time for home life, this has been their lot.

At last they revolted. Risking suffering and hunger, risking the assault of the brutal bulles of the Steel Trust, who do not stop even at murder; they resorted to the strike to make their masters lighten the conditions of their toil. They organized their power and united dared challenge to a test of strength the industrial octopus which dominates the steel industry.

Gary is the City of Steel. It was built by the order of the Steel Trust. The influence and control of the Steel Trust extends to every nook and corner of the life of the city. Its spies are everywhere. The local government is its tool and expresses its will. The Steel Trust municipal government forbade the workingmen to show their solidarity by parades and public meetings. It hoped by keeping the workers apart to break their spirit, to give encouragement to the few scabs who were working.

For two weeks the workers submitted. They permitted the Steel Trust government to trample underfoot the democratic rights which they had been so often assured were the heritage of the people of this country. They let the industrial masters demonstrate clearly that not "democracy" but iron-fisted autocracy was for the workers, the aftermath of the war.

Then, these workers broke into spontaneous protest. The mayor, the Steel Trust tool, had forbidden them to meet in public. He had forbidden them to parade through the streets. But they would meet and would parade. (Last sentence italicized.)

They formed in line with 500 uniformed men, strikers all, at the head of the line and marched through the heart of the city. This mass action of the workers won. Their mass power conquered. The orders of the mayor became mere rags of paper. Ten thousand workers marched through the heart of the city, and in place of upholding the orders of the mayor the militia and police cleared the way for the strikers—became their servants, because they were showing their power.

But capitalism was not done. The Steel Trust does not only have at its beck and call the power of the local government but the National Government, the State, is equally its servants. The workers had won the first skirmish through their mass power. They must be taught a lesson. They must be cowed and thrown back into their former position of abject slaves.

The orders went forth. Soon the long line of truckloads of Regular soldiers were on the way to Gary. The men who, the workers had been told a short year ago, were fighting their battle for democracy upon the blood-stained fields of Europe, and whom they had been urged to support by giving the last of their strength to the work of production, these men were coming to teach them "democracy." And with them came their instruments of murder, their automatic rifles, their machine guns, the cannon that could clear a street 2 miles long in a few minutes, and the helmets that the workers of Gary had produced. Gary was to be shown how the Czar and Kaiser treated rebellious workmen.

The National Government, the capitalist state, had stepped in. The Steel Trust was in danger of being beaten. It might have to submit before the power of the workers. To save itself it brought into the field the instrument forged by the capitalists to uphold their system of exploitation and oppression, the State, which in spite of all its democratic pretensions is but the physical expression of the dictatorship of the capitalist class.

Workmen of the United States, the capitalists are challenging you.

They are demonstrating before your very eyes that the governmental power is theirs, for use against you when you dare strike against the enslavement which they force upon you.

The homes of the workmen of Gary are being raided, their meetings forbidden, their literature confiscated by the military régime which controls Gary, Martial law is supreme. The instruments to destroy the lives of the workers are ready.

Are you, workmen of this country, going to submit meekly to the use of military invasion and force to break your strikes? Shall the iron heel rule unchallenged?

This is the hour to rouse the workers.

Gather in great mass meetings. Bring to the attention of the unenlightened workers the meaning of martial law at Gary. Show them that it is not enough to strike against low wages and bad working conditions, but that the strike must be directed against capitalism.

The workers must capture the power of the State. They must wrest from the capitalists the means through which the capitalist rules is maintained.

The answer to the dictatorship of the capitalists is the dictatorship of the workers.

That circular, I am informed, was written by an official of the Communist Party, whose name is Ferguson, and was printed, I am informed, on the I. W. W. press in Chicago. These have also been found in the quarters of the enlisted men of the Motor Transport Corps, Chicago. Some of them stuck up in toilets and places like that. It is propaganda.

Senator PHIPPS. I may say that an exact copy of that circular came to me through the mails this morning from West Virginia, with the statement that it had been generally distributed in the city of Steubenville, Ohio.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. It comes from Chicago, I am very reliably informed.

Senator PHIPPS. Lieutenant, can you tell us what labor leaders were in charge of the strike at Gary while you were there?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not even know the names of all the officers of the labor organizations. I have never had a list submitted and have never asked for it.

Senator PHIPPS. Was William Z. Foster in Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Not to my knowledge; I never heard of his being in Gary.

Senator STERLING. You have heard of his activities, have you not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Oh, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. I was only speaking of personal contact. Now, about Fitzpatrick. Was he in Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I believe he has been in Gary; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Had you known Fitzpatrick in Chicago?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. He is generally considered not radical exactly, but more of an eccentric character; not a radical in the nature that Foster is a radical; that is his general reputation.

Senator PHIPPS. Is he the same Fitzpatrick who was a candidate for the position of mayor of Chicago?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. On what ticket?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Sort of a labor ticket.

Senator PHIPPS. Has your department any information as to Fitzpatrick's activities in Chicago?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. We have never made an investigation as to Fitzpatrick's activities in Chicago except as they have been brought to us; sometimes discharged officers bring in pamphlets such as sent to you. We file them away for information.

I would like to say before I close that there has been no effort to interfere in any way by anyone connected with our department of the military, so far as I know, with the strike in Gary.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you permitted meetings?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. We have permitted meetings in the halls at any time, under any circumstances; but outdoor meetings, no. They did permit one outdoor meeting. Gen. Wood gave permission for one outdoor meeting.

Senator STERLING. One outdoor meeting?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. A meeting of the strikers?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. When you arrest these men, what do you do with them?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Bring them up and have a talk with them, as I have outlined here, and make notes on what they say, on what they know; and if they are held for the immigration authorities, they are booked in the police department. If no other action is taken, they are warned and sent home and there is no record made in the police department or anywhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. Some letters have been sent to the committee about stockades.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A stockade has been built in one of the vacant lots across from headquarters. Up to the time I left Gary nobody had been put in it, however. I believe I saw a newspaper report that they had put one or two men in there and those men were now working on the streets. They had violated military orders; but I never saw one in there up to the time I left Gary.



The CHAIRMAN. What kind of a stockade is this?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. A house surrounded by a barbed-wire fence; a small wooden shack surrounded by a barbed-wire fence.

Senator STERLING. Did you find any evidences at Gary of intimidation by the strikers of men who were working in the mill?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Tell us about that.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I found innumerable complaints. We tried to get at the bottom of it, and in several instances submitted our evidence to the State's attorney for action, where the complaint appeared to be well founded. A great many of those complaints were not well founded; some of them were.

But I would like to say before I close my testimony, sir, that all the laboring men of Gary that belonged to the American Federation of Labor are not reds by any means. There is a sprinkling of Americans in that group. I had a chicken dinner one Sunday in the home of a man on strike, and he was just as interested in this red problem as I was myself and was just as much concerned over it as I was myself.

Senator STERLING. In the sense of being anxious about it?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Fearful about it?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; he was very much interested in what was going on, and said that in his opinion it had sort of gotten beyond them.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the population of Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Between 20,000 and 25,000, I would estimate; I do not know exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many men are employed there in the mills?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. One mill alone employes about 10,000, and the rest run, oh, 1,500 or so, in that neighborhood.

Senator PHIPPS. A great many of the employees must live in the adjoining towns?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes. They live at Aetna and Millers Crossing and East Hammond and Hammond. East Chicago—it is all run together around the corner of Lake Michigan; it is a continuous string of steel mills, the steel industry.

Senator PHIPPS. You were in many of those homes, Lieutenant, in running down some of this information that had been given you. What was the general appearance of those houses—were they comfortable or not?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They need education. I did not go in so very many myself. I was generally at headquarters, but I did go into some of them, and I can say that those people need education and help on how to live comfortably; they do not know how, even though they have the money.

Senator SMITH. The houses themselves, what about them?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. The houses themselves could be made very comfortable, most of them. Gary is a pretty little town.

Senator SMITH. It is the lack of domestic science inside the house, then?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. For instance, one house I remember, they had built a high board fence around the front of the house and

turned ducks and chickens in, and they were wandering promiscuously around the house. I suppose that man had more money than I have in the bank, however.

The CHAIRMAN. Do many of these workers own their own homes?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; a good many.

The CHAIRMAN. Do many of the foreigners own their homes?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; some of them do. Some of them positively stated that they wanted to go back to the old country, even though they owned their own homes and had money in the bank.

Senator STERLING. How many rooms are in those houses?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Some of them were cottages of two rooms and a kitchen downstairs and probably two rooms upstairs, or something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do they want to go back to the old country?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They give various reasons. I think curiosity is back of a good many of their motives.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they going to stay?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. They want to look around and they do not know whether they are going to stay or not.

Senator SMITH. Do they want a Soviet government?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes, sir. They go back with their money and perhaps establish some little business, and then they will be wealthy with a few thousand dollars over there.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the schools in Gary?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I understand the schools are first rate.

The CHAIRMAN. And the children of these people are going to the schools?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. Yes; and that is the big hope.

Senator SMITH. Are any of them going to foreign schools?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not know of any in Gary. The kids are usually real Americans, after they get to the school stage.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether there is any compulsory school law in Indiana?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not know; no, sir.

Senator STERLING. What evidence did you find, if any, in regard to the workers sending money back to the old country, especially the single men?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. There is very little of that, on account of the war, I presume.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything more you can tell us?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I can not think of anything, unless there is some particular phase of the question that you are interested in.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you.

If any of the witnesses who are to be heard to-morrow are here and desire to testify now, we can hear them.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe my report will take considerable time. Do you wish to start this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN. I think we had better start this afternoon.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. OSCAR EDWARD ANDERSON.

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Have you some kind of a formal statement you want to make, or do you want to go ahead in your own way?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; I did not come prepared to make a formal statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the Anderson who has been referred to?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I suppose I am.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a citizen of the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; I was born and raised in Chicago, Ill.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business now?

Mr. ANDERSON. At the present time I am a striker.

The CHAIRMAN. But before the strike what were you?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was a guide setter in the rail mill.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you hold some official position with the labor organizations at Gary?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am president of Hustler Lodge, No. 36, of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, and chairman of the Allied Iron and Steel Workers' Council, in Gary. The organization represents all the steel workers organized.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have you go ahead in your own way and tell us the reasons of the strike at Gary, how the strike is being carried on, and what the men are striking for.

Senator SMITH. Before that, may I ask if you are an I. W. W.?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Have you ever been?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. What organizations are you a member of?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am a member of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers.

Senator SMITH. That is all?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is all.

Senator STERLING. I thought you named one other organization when you gave your name to the reporter.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am chairman of the Allied Iron and Steel Workers' Council. That is the organization that represents all the steel workers in Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that have charge of the strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have charge of the strike; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. But your name appeared on the roster of this Hungarian socialist meeting.

Mr. ANDERSON. Shall I explain that?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; if you please.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was a member of the Socialist Party at one time, and was mentioned with Economoff when I was secretary of a temporary organization for the purpose of nominating candidates for State and county officers. I believe that was previous to the election of 1916; I am not sure. But, however, I was elected secretary at this particular meeting of the temporary county council, and Economoff was chairman. That was to provide for the nomination of candidates for office on the Socialist ticket for this particular election.

Senator STERLING. Whereabouts was that?

Mr. ANDERSON. In Gary, Ind. And after the election, of course, my name was stricken from that roster, because the organization did not exist. I maintained my membership in the Socialist Party up until about a year ago, or something like that. I don't remember

just when; and the English branch, to which I belonged, does not exist at the present time.

Senator PHIPPS. Is the Hungarian branch still in existence?

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not say. I have had no connection with the Socialist Party for at least a year.

The English branch was broken up previous to the signing of the armistice, and has not been reorganized, and no attempt has been made to reorganize it since that date. As to the other branches, I know nothing about them, because I have had no connection with them since that time.

Senator McKELLAR. And you do not belong to any anarchist association?

Mr. ANDERSON. Positively no.

Senator SMITH. Have you ever been an I. W. W.?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir. I have been working in the steel industry off and on since I was 14 years old. I came to Gary in February, I believe, of 1909, after serving 4 years in the United States Navy. Gary was a new town and a new steel industry, in which I was interested, and I went to work there in February or March, 1909, worked there until April, 1910, and returned to Gary again in September of the same year, and have been working there in that particular steel industry from that day up until the 22d day of September. I have lived in Gary continuously during that time. About August or September of last year there was a plan put on foot by the American Federation of Labor to organize the steelworkers all over the country, and I believe they started in Gary or Joliet. However, in September of 1918 they called mass meetings in Gary for the purpose of bringing this to the attention of the workers, and I was one of the first to become a member of this particular organization, and after the workers had been partially organized the organizers left the field for other parts of the country, and myself and a number of others took up the work where they had left it off.

Senator STERLING. Who were the organizers before you were there?

Mr. ANDERSON. There was Ed Knight and Glover, of the blacksmiths—I do not know his initials—and one man from the mine, mill, and cement workers, who has a foreign name, and I can not think of it. It is a rather difficult name to remember; and John Fitzpatrick spoke at one of the meetings, and Herbert F. Reese was one of the organizers; and a man by the name of Johnstone. He comes from West Virginia.

Senator STERLING. And William Z. Foster; was he there?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe William Z. Foster was ever in Gary; to the best of my knowledge he was never in Gary. I will not make that as a positive statement, but to the best of my knowledge he has never been there.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever see him there at any meeting?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have never seen him there. However, we did carry on the work where these organizers had left off, and up to the date of the strike we had practically, we thought, at least, we had about 85 per cent of the Gary mills organized. The strike was called by the national committee, and we, with others, came out on strike on that date.

I do not know whether you gentlemen are familiar with the demands which caused this strike or not, but chief among them—

Senator STERLING. Before going into that, to what extent were Americans organized?

Mr. ANDERSON. To what extent?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, as far as I can learn, the Americans were a little backward about coming into the organization, but before the strike was called and after the strike was called they came in in great numbers, and I imagine that about 25 per cent of the men organized were Americans. By that I do not mean American citizens but American born. The skilled men, to a great extent, in the steel mills of Gary are American born.

Senator McKELLAR. What proportion in the mills where the men are out on strike now?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe I can say safely about 76 per cent of the originals—

Senator McKELLAR. You mean of the entire number?

Senator SMITH. Of the men in the plant when you went out—

Senator McKELLAR. Oh, I understand, but how many, about, are on a strike, how many of the original number, how many are in the plant altogether?

Mr. ANDERSON. Altogether engaged in the steel industry there, there is the Illinois Steel Co., the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co.—those two belong to the United States Steel Corporation. Then there is the bolt and screw workers. It has been connected with the other company, with the Illinois Steel Co., but I don't know whether it is now, I would not say. Referring to the bolt and screw workers, about 500 are out on strike. They came out on strike about three weeks prior to September 22. The rest of them are probably—well, a few days previous to the strike I was called before two superintendents for a certain reason, which I will explain later, and they told me that there are 20,000 men working for the United States Steel Corporation in Gary. I believe that was exaggerated. We figure from general knowledge that there are about 18,000.

Senator McKELLAR. About 18,000. Well, now, how many of those went out on strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. About 97 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many are out now?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe I stated that about 76 per cent are still out; that is, more or less, out of that particular number of the whole number that went out.

Senator STERLING. While 76 per cent of those who struck are yet out on strike, according to your statement, have the places of any of those been taken by others, by new workers?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator STERLING. What proportion of the original number are now employed, do you think, in the mills?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of the original number of strikers?

Senator STERLING. Yes; of the original number of employees, what proportion are back?

Mr. ANDERSON. Between 25 and 30 per cent.

Senator STERLING. But how many men, all told, would you think are back?

Senator McKELLAR. You mean how many are working now?

Senator SMITH. How many new men have come in?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is something I could not say; but there are large numbers of strangers in the mills now, mostly Negroes, and the old employees who did not come out the first day of the strike, and those who have gone back since the strike, I would say that about between 25 and 30 per cent of these altogether are in the mill; that is, of the original employees.

Senator STERLING. Yes; I understand that. But, compared with the original employees, at that time you think which were about 18,000 men, how many now would you say are employed in the mill, including the original employees?

Mr. ANDERSON. Everybody?

Senator STERLING. Yes. Those who have come in since the strike.

Mr. ANDERSON. You mean what number of men were originally employed?

Senator STERLING. Yes. What percentage of the original force are now employed?

Senator SMITH. You throw him off on that.

Senator STERLING. Not altogether.

Senator SMITH. What number of men would you say are now at work in the mills?

Senator STERLING. I think he understands.

Mr. ANDERSON. You want to know what percentage of the original number that went on strike are now back at work?

Senator STERLING. Not the percentage of that original number, but what percentage of that original number would you find working in the mills now, including those who did not strike and those who have come in?

Mr. ANDERSON. And those who have come in of the strikers?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I would say about 28 or 29—well, about 35 per cent, all told, including those who did not go out and those who have come in.

Senator STERLING. You would say about 35 per cent?

Mr. ANDERSON. Between 30 and 35 per cent is the estimate given to me by pickets on duty.

Senator SMITH. You think the mill is running 35 per cent?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of normal capacity?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not say that.

Senator MCKELLAR. Do you think there are six or seven thousand men at work now?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say somewhere around 5,000 men are working in the plant, but these men, a great number of them, are strangers brought in there and are not familiar with the work, and therefore they are not producing.

Senator SMITH. They are not producing that per cent?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are not producing the amount of material that the experienced men would produce. The company employs those who go out trying to get strikers to come back, going from house to house, and they say that the plant is running about 50 per cent of normal capacity.

Senator STERLING. Are the different parts of the mill in operation now? Are the different kinds of work in the mill being carried on?

Mr. ANDERSON. Some parts. The mill in which I work has been shut down completely. There has been no attempt to operate that since the strike.

Senator PHIPPS. That is the rail mill?

Mr. ANDERSON. The rail mill. This mill employed between 350 and 400 men in normal times.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Anderson, while you were in Chicago as a young man, before you went into the Navy, were you a member of a union.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir. I worked in the Illinois Steel plant at South Chicago for a short time, two different times, about five or six months each time; and then I worked around in the Chicago Ship-building Co., and also at the Kenwood Bridge Co. and for the M. & D. Range Co. and several smaller companies.

Senator PHIPPS. When you went to Gary and took employment in the rail mill there, you were there quite a time before you joined the union?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Could you give this committee your leading reasons for going into a union?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. The reason why I, as well as a great number of others, joined the union is because we felt that 12 hours was too long a time for any man to work in that particular industry, and the wages were, on the average, not sufficient to give every man an opportunity to support his family and send his children to school and maintain his home properly.

Senator PHIPPS. What were your earnings averaging?

Mr. ANDERSON. On the average for the whole period my earnings were probably about between \$4.75 and \$5 a day, but—

Senator PHIPPS. During the month of September, just before you went on a strike, what were your earnings then?

Mr. ANDERSON. \$8.45 was the day rate; but here you must understand that there are various days in the steel industry when the mills are shut down and the men are thrown on the mercy of the world. They do not work and do not earn anything.

Senator SMITH. Take your last 12 months before you went on strike? What were you able to average a day during that 12 months?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say about \$9 for the 12 months.

Senator SMITH. \$9 a day?

Mr. ANDERSON. And that would not include the time that I was off sick and lost in other ways, by reason of occupational diseases, such as rheumatism, etc.

Senator PHIPPS. The days he worked he averaged \$9 a day.

Mr. ANDERSON. The days I worked.

Senator McKELLAR. You made over \$3,000 a year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Last year when I made my income-tax return, \$1,995 was what I paid income tax on.

Senator McKELLAR. Nearly \$3,000 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Nearly \$2,000.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you a married man?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was up until November 4 of last year.

Senator McKELLAR. Then you were exempted \$2,000 when you made that return, or did you only get \$1,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not exempted at all.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, you just earned \$1,995?

Mr. ANDERSON. That was last year.

Senator McKELLAR. I see.

Mr. ANDERSON. And when I made out my statement—this is just an explanation—when I made out my returns, the clerk told me that I would be exempted \$1,000, owing to the fact that I had been a married man, and when we sent it to the Indianapolis office, to the collector, he returned the letter, stating that I would not be exempted at all, and I appealed to the department here, and was also informed that I was not entitled to exemption.

Senator SMITH. The total returns from your work were a little less than \$2,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. A little less than \$2,000.

Senator SMITH. You did not make that in addition to what you were allowed as an exemption? Your total income was not quite \$2,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. My total income for 1918 was \$1,995, according to the company's own statement.

Senator McKELLAR. Then, you did not work every day by any manner of means?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir. I lost a good deal of time, owing to my wife's illness and my own.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not understand on what ground they could allow you an exemption of \$1,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not either. I went to a lawyer for that purpose.

Senator STERLING. Did you put that matter into the hands of a lawyer?

Mr. ANDERSON. I asked him, and he said, "We will write a letter to the Treasury Department here in Washington and ask them about it." and we did, and they returned the answer, stating that the exemption—there is a clause in there that exempts you \$1,000, or rather exempts you one-twelfth for every month that you had dependents, but this letter informed me that that had been repealed, or something, I do not know exactly the wording of it, but, however, I was not exempted, and I paid the income on the \$1,995, or rather the income as required by law.

Senator STERLING. Barring the time that you were absent during the year on sick leave, or because of illness in your family, you worked continuously, did you?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. The whole year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; that was during the war that you are talking about, you remember, and we worked seven days a week.

Senator McKELLAR. What was your income that year?

Senator STERLING. This was the year.

Mr. ANDERSON. This was part of that same year.

Senator McKELLAR. Part of the same year?

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand this is the year 1918 that you are speaking of.



Senator SMITH. Then you lost a great deal of time on account of your wife's illness.

Mr. ANDERSON. I lost some time on account of my wife's sickness, and also my own. I had lumbago and rheumatism, due to being in the water all the time, being a guide setter, who has to be in the water all the time. There are very few times that he does not get soaked.

Senator PHIPPS. Your work as a guide setter is mostly while the rolls are not in operation, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Both.

Senator PHIPPS. And you have to watch them while the rolling process is going on as well?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, you can not be down under the rollers. On a 12-hour shift, about how much work would you actually put in? What rest periods would you have? I will put it that way..

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, a guide setter perhaps would have considerable time for rest periods on some days. Other days he would work continuously for the 12 hours, and a guide setter is an exceptionally easy job, so far as actual work is concerned, actually being actively engaged in doing something.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. But a guide setter does his work whenever he gets a chance, whenever the mill stops rolling for a few minutes, or something like that, and the rest of the time he would be continually there and watching, so that if anything happens he can immediately attend to it.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes. It is not continuous, but it is variable, according to the conditions of the operation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. In your own interest, lest your testimony should be questioned, how much was your total income tax that you paid?

Mr. ANDERSON. My total income tax last year?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe I paid a dollar and some cents at the company's office, and after my return had gone to Indianapolis to the collector, he sent me a bill for \$60, and I protested, as I have already explained, and later when I found that I was in the wrong, I sent him a check for \$60.

Senator SMITH. Then you did get a credit on your tax? He did not charge you the full tax?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may have gotten some credit, but, however, I believe I had some additional income besides that, because after my wife died I broke up housekeeping and sold some of the stuff we had, and I included that in the return.

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Anderson, what are you all striking for? Just give us your reasons.

Mr. ANDERSON. The eight-hour day, principally.

Senator McKELLAR. When you say an eight-hour day, do you mean an eight-hour day of work?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are you satisfied with the wages that you are now receiving?

Senator SMITH. Per hour?

Senator McKELLAR. Per hour.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am personally satisfied with the wages I am receiving at the present time.

Senator McKELLAR. But you have an eight-hour day, so far as the measurement of wages is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I know; but we still work 12 hours a day.

Senator McKELLAR. Would you be willing yourself, as I understand you, if you could get an eight-hour day to take the proportionate part of the eight-hour day? I mean the pay per hour. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I believe you have got me wrong there.

Senator McKELLAR. What would you be willing to do? You do not want 12 hours' pay for eight hours' work?

Mr. ANDERSON. I consider, and we all consider—the strikers—that we are entitled to the present wages and still work only eight hours.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; I see.

Mr. ANDERSON. We contend that what we produce makes sufficient profit that the company can pay us wages sufficient whereby we can maintain our homes and send our children to school and educate them the same as anyone else.

Senator McKELLAR. What did you get before the war?

Mr. ANDERSON. Before the war?

Senator McKELLAR. Per hour?

Mr. ANDERSON. When I first went on this particular job that I mentioned the wage was \$5.25. That was in 1916, on election day.

Senator McKELLAR. How much per hour was that for skilled labor? You are a skilled laborer?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. What was your rate?

Mr. ANDERSON. We do not work by the hour. We work by the turn.

Senator McKELLAR. You work by the turn?

Mr. ANDERSON. A 12-hour turn.

Senator McKELLAR. How much per hour was unskilled labor getting at that time, on election day, 1916?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not remember exactly.

Senator McKELLAR. Was it 17 cents an hour?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it was 16½ cents an hour, or 19½ cents; I would not be sure.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, 16½ cents or 19½ cents. Since that time it has been raised?

Mr. ANDERSON. Since that time it has been raised.

Senator McKELLAR. To 42 cents?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. It has gradually been raised every now and then. During the war, especially, it was raised four different times.

Senator McKELLAR. If it has been raised from 16½ cents to 42 cents, then it has been raised much faster than the cost of living, and so, in a lesser degree, it has been raised faster than the cost of living if it was 19½ cents. Those whose wages have been increased faster than the cost of living in these times have been doing pretty well, haven't they?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say that those who have been so fortunate; yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you consider your wages—isn't it perfectly apparent that your wages have been increased very largely over 100 per cent since 1916?

Mr. ANDERSON. They have been increased 100 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. The cost of living has been increased about 87 per cent, according to the figures of the department.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would you include rent and everything else in that?

Senator McKELLAR. Rent and everything, according to their figures. So that it seems to me that as pay for the steel industry—it pays its employees pretty well. From what I could learn out at Pittsburgh, and you have the same wages at Gary that they have at Pittsburgh, is it not true that it is the hours of labor that concerns you more than the pay?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think it is a matter of right that a man should get with the pay that is good, that he should get as much pay for an 8-hour day as he does for a 12-hour day?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that a man should get sufficient wages so that he may maintain his home according to American standards, and I want to say frankly that in Gary such is not the case in a large percentage of cases.

Senator SMITH. Does the Steel Corporation own most of the houses that the men rent?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not most of them; about 30 per cent, I would say, roughly, Senator.

Senator McKELLAR. What kind of houses do you live in—how many rooms?

Mr. ANDERSON. These houses, on an average, are five rooms. Some of them are six.

Senator McKELLAR. And what do they rent for?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. This man here—

Mr. RATTENBURY (interposing). I live in a company house, and pay \$26 a month.

Senator STERLING. How many rooms?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Six rooms.

Senator STERLING. Do you have a bathroom?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And it was built by the company?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. That is about one-half of what we pay here in Washington.

Mr. RATTENBURY. It is much cheaper than the average run of rent for that kind of a house there. That same kind of a house in Gary, I might say, would be at least \$45 a month, so that if the employee was not fortunate enough to have a company house to live in, he would have to pay at least \$45 a month.

Senator SMITH. Has the company put up the rents on you in the last two or three years?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir; it has not.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, you get company houses at almost 50 per cent less than you can rent houses out in the town?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir; I would not say 50 per cent; about 45 per cent.

Senator McKELLAR. That is not a cause of complaint against the company, is it, hardly?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There is no complaint there whatever.

Senator McKELLAR. No complaint about rents?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Not so far as I am concerned.

Senator McKELLAR. I should say not. If you were here in Washington, I do not believe you could get a six-room house for less than \$50 or \$60 or \$75 a month.

Mr. RATTENBURY. In discussing this wage problem—it is very few employees that are fortunate enough to have a house like that.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of these company houses are there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I really do not know. There were about 300, I believe, built in the first place. I have been in the employ of the company since the mill started. Then, when the tin-plate was built they built another group for the tin-plate employees. I believe that their rent there is more than the rent of the original group of houses.

Senator STERLING. Do many of the employees own their houses?

Mr. ANDERSON. Do many of them?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. They are not all paid for. A good portion of the employees are paying for their homes.

Senator STERLING. Do they borrow money of the company for that purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON. That has been the practice in the last few months.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. A number of the employees have borrowed money from the company.

Senator STERLING. At what rate of interest does the company loan money to the men to build houses?

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not tell you that. He knows. [Indicating Mr. Rattenbury.]

Mr. RATTENBURY. I could tell you a story about that.

Senator STERLING. You expect to testify, do you?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. What interest do they charge?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The interest they charge for borrowed money is 6 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Anderson, you said something in answer to a question by Senator McKellar with regard to wages. You said, as I understood you, that you were satisfied with the wages you received. As I understand, fundamentally you have another idea about it, haven't you, from what you say? You take into consideration the profits of which you produce, and claim that labor should have a higher percentage than it has been receiving of the wealth which it creates?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not say that. I would say that while we produce enough to give us the same—if we produce enough to give us the same wages for 8 hours as for 12 hours we should have that.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that with a shorter day you could produce as much as in a longer day?

Mr. ANDERSON. I contend that we could, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. Is not the steel industry, though, so situated that it must be continuous, and if you reduce the day to an eight-hour day, in practice, would not you have to have three shifts instead of two?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And would not the cost be increased correspondingly to the owner? In other words, would not the labor cost be just one-third more if your contention that you should receive the same for an 8-hour day as for a 12-hour day be carried out?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I contend that in the steel industry we could produce as much in the 8 hours as we are producing now in 12, and the additional shift would be the same.

Senator SMITH. You contend that three shifts can produce one-third more than two shifts would?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say that.

Senator SMITH. That is your view?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. That is my view of it, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What about conditions in the mill? You have been in the mill business a good part of your life?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How are the conditions in Gary as compared to those in other mills that you know of?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I have worked in the South Chicago works of the Illinois Steel Co., and also the Pueblo Works.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. And I would say that the conditions are about the same in all three of those places; that is, Gary and Pueblo and South Chicago.

Senator SMITH. There is not any complaint about conditions, is there? They do all they can to make the conditions favorable to the men?

Mr. ANDERSON. To a certain extent they do. Now, in the coke plant, and also in the blast furnaces and around there, there are complaints about the conditions, such as safety, and in the coke plant they complain of the sanitary conditions being very unfavorable, and also around the blast furnaces.

Senator SMITH. Is yours highly skilled work?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, would not say that it is highly skilled, but as a rule you won't find men employed as guide setters unless they have been working for at least three years in the mill.

Senator SMITH. What is the highest skilled labor at Gary paid? What class of work is the highest skilled?

Mr. ANDERSON. The highest skilled is the rollers.

Senator SMITH. What do they pay for that?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are on a salary, and some of them average as high as \$5,000 a year and some less than that, possibly as low as \$3,000 a year. They are the highest paid men, and highly skilled.

Senator SMITH. What proportion of the labor there consists of that class of men?

Mr. ANDERSON. These highly-paid men?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, the rollers and the melters in the open hearths. I suppose—well, less than 10 per cent of the whole.

Senator SMITH. The two together?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. In the mill that I worked in, as I stated, we employed about 350 to 400 men under normal conditions. In that mill we had two rollers, one on each shift. In the Merchant mill they have one roller on each shift, and I believe there are seven of them there. That makes 14 rollers in all, and I believe the entire number of men employed in these 7 mills would reach possibly 3,000 men.

Senator PHIPPS. How many helpers are there in the rail mill in which you work?

Mr. ANDERSON. Helpers?

Senator PHIPPS. Rollers' helpers.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is one assistant roller on each turn.

Senator PHIPPS. Who are the next men?

Mr. ANDERSON. The guide setter on the finishing rolls. That is the occupation that I was employed at.

Senator McKELLAR. I was interested in your saying that a guide setter was in water for a great deal of the day. Just explain that. Do you have rubber boots, or how?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not in water, but when you work around the rolls, the water splashes on you all the time and your clothes get wet, you understand, and your shoes, and of course it would be impossible to change clothes every time you get wet, because you would be changing clothes every 15 minutes, sometimes, and at other times you would only be doing it once or twice a day.

Senator McKELLAR. And you say that produces a certain disease?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; rheumatism. I believe that that is what causes rheumatism. At least, I have been told that such is the case. It affects different places. In the arms, the wrists, and legs, or something like that. It affects me to the extent that I have lumbago. I have been informed by physicians that being wet and having wet feet causes this lumbago. I do not know anything more about it than that.

Senator SMITH. What proportion of the force at Gary is entirely unskilled labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. Entirely unskilled?

Senator SMITH. What would be classed as unskilled labor?

Senator PHIPPS. Of the common labor.

Senator SMITH. Common labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. A very small per cent. I could not just tell you what per cent, but I would say, roughly speaking, about 20 per cent of them are absolutely unskilled in any way. That is, they are of the common pick and shovel kind.

Senator SMITH. Common labor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Common labor.

Senator SMITH. All the others grading from that up to the rollers, who make \$5,000 a year?

Mr. ANDERSON. And melters. During the war, when these several increases in wages were given, their wages were increased more in proportion than the others; consequently, it brought the laborers' wages up nearer to the level than it did the others.

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is, they were raised greater in proportion than the rest.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Anderson, how long did you say you had been working at Gary in this mill prior to September 22? When did you go to Gary?

Mr. ANDERSON. I went there in January or February of 1901, and I left in April, 1910, and returned again in September, 1910, and worked there up until the 22d of September of this year, with the exception of a few months in which the mills were shut down completely, and of course I went around to different places at that time.

Senator PHIPPS. During your experience there, what did you note as to complaints on the part of the men, when anything went wrong, that they thought it necessary to complain about, would they go to the foreman in charge?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, no; not very often. They would generally go to the man that—any group of men has a leader, to a certain extent, a man that they look up to to do the talking for them.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. And I was considered one of those among the skilled men in that particular mill where I was employed, and whenever anything was wrong, they would come to me and we would talk it over, a group of us, and sometimes we went to the foreman of the plant, but other times we did not see him, because of previous experience we knew that it would not do any good, and we simply dropped it there; we growled about it, and we dropped it there.

Senator PHIPPS. You referred to having some differences with some of the officials shortly before this strike.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; that was not a difference, exactly. Before this strike was called—about three weeks before this strike was called—the company started a movement on foot to discourage men going on strike and also to discourage them from joining the union, and they carried that on all during the campaign; and at this particular time they were anxious to prevent a strike, and they selected superintendents who were fairly good speakers and sent them to different departments; they covered the entire plant, one department at a time, and they would call sometimes all of the employees into the office or at some designated place and tell them a little story about why they should not go on strike, etc., and at other times they would take one man out at a time and talk to him on the subject. And at this particular time, being the chairman of the Steel Workers' Council, a man by the name of Comstock, who was master mechanic in the Illinois Steel Co. plant at Gary, and a timekeeper by the name of Mr. Nygaard, sent for me to appear at Comstock's office, and I went before them. That was a few days previous to the strike; and I was in there for about an hour and twenty minutes, or something like that, and they discussed various phases of the strike and tried to impress upon my mind the futility and absurdity of the strike, and tried to point out to me especially that there was no possible chance of us ever winning the strike, because the company had every means at their disposal to prevent us winning it, such as money unlimited, and they could shut down one plant and run another one, and various other excuses; and also tried to point out to me that if I would exert as much effort in the interest of the company as I did in the

interest of the organization of my fellow workmen I would in time be on the same footing as they were; and various arguments were presented to me why I should not go on strike and why I should not interest myself in this organization of workers. That is the time I had reference to when I was called before these two gentlemen.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, that was after you had joined the union and they knew that you were a member of the union?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; they knew that I was president of the council.

Senator PHIPPS. And you continued working up until the strike was called?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. When you joined their union—we have had some testimony on this point, of the payment of dues and initiation fees—is there a regular initiation fee?

Mr. ANDERSON. The initiation fee at the time of this organization campaign was \$3.

Senator PHIPPS. And do you know if any part of that went to the organizer as a payment for signing up the men?

Mr. ANDERSON. I know for a positive fact that in Gary it did not. There may have been one or two organizers that had applications and did not turn them in, or something like that, but after he did do that—no one was ever accused of doing it, to my knowledge, and I attended the convention of this organization in Louisville, Ky., in May, and there was nothing of that kind brought up.

Senator PHIPPS. Then, of course, while the members of the union are working they pay certain regular dues monthly?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; this organization's dues were \$1.25 a month.

Senator PHIPPS. \$1.25 a month?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And when you are on strike you have no further dues to pay; your dues cease?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; according to the constitution we are supposed to pay our dues.

Senator PHIPPS. How are you going to pay them if you are not employed?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, in that case you defer payment until you are employed.

Senator PHIPPS. What strike benefits are being paid at the present time in Gary?

Mr. ANDERSON. The strike benefits by the Amalgamated should be, according to the constitution, \$6 a week, I believe, but on this particular strike, owing to the fact that there are so large a number of men involved, the organization committee figured that it could not pay strike benefits to the strikers individually, so they concluded to pool their benefits among all the organizations and establish commissaries in the different strike zones, and then we took—each organization has its local treasury from which they draw funds to members who are in need. We have taken care of quite a number in Gary during this strike. Even in the first week of the strike we found it necessary to take care of a number of families, such as buying



shoes for the children so that they could go to school, and everything in connection with that.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any knowledge or any figures as to the membership of the American Federation of Labor in the United States? Do you know what the total membership is?

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not say positively.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe Mr. Gompers made the statement that the sum total was in the neighborhood of 4,000,000 members.

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not verify that statement. I only have the word of the organizers and Mr. Gompers, and the statement has been made on various occasions that it was about 4,000,000 members.

Senator PHIPPS. About 4,000,000 members?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, the highest figure stated here by any witness during our hearings as to the number of men on strike was 360,000, in round figures. Does it seem possible that with 4,000,000 members—and you paid yourself an initiation fee of \$3, and where dues are assessed \$1.25 a month, or \$15 a year, for dues—that with 4,000,000 members that they can not take care of less than 10 per cent of their membership by paying them weekly strike benefits while out on strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will explain that to the best of my knowledge. Each craft takes care of its own members, and there are 24 international unions, or 24 different crafts involved in this strike. Now, there are a number of other crafts connected with the American Federation of Labor who are not on strike, but who have been on strike at various times, or perhaps may be using their funds for some purpose or other, such as organizing and things of that kind, and building labor temples or establishing newspapers or something in connection with their work, and consequently their funds are not available for this strike.

Senator SMITH. Only the funds of the particular craft go to the payment of benefits to that craft?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. To the individual members of that craft?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Senator SMITH. And the whole Federation of Labor membership do not assume it, do they?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; they do not.

Senator SMITH. And each craft acts by itself?

Mr. ANDERSON. Each craft pays its own way.

Senator SMITH. In the olden times of the railroads, the engineers brotherhood and the firemen's brotherhood, and the blacksmiths and the trainmen, all of the particular crafts took care of their particular branch; the engineers took care of the engineers; the firemen took care of the firemen, and so on.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you understand that these other crafts pay initiation fees and dues on about the same basis as the Amalgamated?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I believe on the average; yes. At some particular point they may pay a higher initiation fee, or they may pay more dues, but on the whole, averaged up altogether, I believe they pay about the same, from \$1 to \$1.50.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you stopped to figure that eliminating that question of initiation, that if the estimate of 4,000,000 members is nearly accurate, that there is an annual fund involved of \$60,000,000 paid into the 24 internationals affiliated in the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I have never figured it out, but I imagine that it is an enormous sum of money.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, it is simply a matter of arithmetic, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; but out of that sum must come all rents and sick benefits and organization expenses, such as during the campaign for the organization of the steel workers, thousands of dollars have been spent for hall rents and paying extra organizers and the expenses of travel from place to place and advertising.

Senator PHIPPS. You are an official of your own lodge; were you under salary for that position?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you act as an organizer?

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not act as an organizer in that sense. I voluntarily went about and organized men, and asked them to come into the organization. I never was salaried.

Senator PHIPPS. You had no compensation for getting in new members?

Mr. ANDERSON. None whatever. Positively no. At the time that I attended the convention I was paid my wages and expenses, the wages that I was getting in the mill, but I never received any compensation, and no one else, to my knowledge, outside of the regular organizers were paid for that kind of work.

Senator PHIPPS. Are the organizers paid more while there is a strike on than they are while there is no strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; not to my knowledge, they are not. There is no reason why they should be. If they were paid more during a strike than during times when there is not any trouble, I imagine there would be quite a rumpus among some of the membership.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, I do not believe that statement was made in this hearing, in these hearings, and I do not want to give you that impression. Mr. Fitzpatrick testified that he has been receiving \$60 a week, but in the early part of September his compensation was raised to \$75 per week.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that I could explain that. I think in September, or some time in the early part of September, the Chicago Federation of Labor had its annual convention, and at such times they reduce the wages or raise them of the various officers according to the expenses that they incur, and it is very probable that at that time, at that particular convention, they raised wages of the president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, and Mr. Fitzpatrick was reelected president and benefited by that increase in wages. That is the only way I can explain it. At our convention in Louisville we raised the wages of our president and the various other officers.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know of any movement being considered or that is under way for the purpose of bringing out men in other industries, such as the railroad work, for the purpose of helping the steel strike or the steel strikers?

Mr. ANDERSON. We had hoped for that, but we have not received any favorable reports. In other words, we have not heard anything that would lead us to think that such would be the case. We had hoped to be supported by the railroad workers who were particularly employed in the steel industry. We did not expect——

Senator PHIPPS. Just a moment, please. Now, this Amalgamated Association, which is a branch of the Internationals you belong to, has it any lodges or membership in any other country—in Canada, for instance?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And you would expect the support from your members in Canada during the strike, would you not, financial support?

Mr. ANDERSON. Financial support? It would become necessary to assess the members, the members in Canada would also be involved, I believe; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any information as to the number of members you have in Canada, in the Canadian industry?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; I have no idea of the number of members in Canada belonging to the amalgamated, but I would think from representations at the convention that there are possibly 4,000 or 5,000 members there. That is just a personal opinion of mine. I have no foundation for it.

Senator PHIPPS. There are at least three or four large plants in Canada, are there not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Such as the Dominion Works?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. There is one in Montreal——

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And at The Soo?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; and I believe the Dominion Steel & Iron Co.

Senator PHIPPS. The Dominion Iron & Steel Co.?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Dominion Iron & Steel Co.

Senator PHIPPS. That is all.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, I would like to ask you a question with reference to the hours of labor. Are there any considerable number of employees that prefer the longer hours and to get the pay for time and a half?

Mr. ANDERSON. In other words——

Senator McKELLAR (interrupting). In other words, do the employees, some of the employees—it has been stated that some of the employees prefer the longer hours because they get time and a half overtime.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I believe there are some.

Senator McKELLAR. To what extent is that feeling prevalent?

Mr. ANDERSON. The percentage is very small. I would not state what percentage, but I personally have not come in contact with any such individual that cared to work longer hours, because of the fact that he received time and a half overtime.

Senator McKELLAR. It rather seemed to me that that was your principal question, the actual eight-hour day—eight hours of actual labor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; that is the main issue.

The CHAIRMAN. What you want, as I understand you, is an eight-hour day, and you want living wages?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And by living wages, you mean wages that will enable you to live according to the standards of the American life and to raise your children and to educate them according to the American standards?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think that that is an issue which the American people would have sympathy with. I know that I would have a sympathetic interest, for one; but don't you think that you could accomplish those things better and have a more sympathetic hearing if you rid your organization of these Reds, who want to destroy the Government? Why don't you get rid of them? Why don't you purge your organization of them?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, any member of a labor organization connected with the American Federation of Labor must live up to the constitution of that organization.

Senator McKELLAR. As against his Government?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; they do not conflict with the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that your constitution is not in conflict with the Government?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; it is not in conflict with the Government.

Senator McKELLAR. But these men are against the Government. Why can't you get rid of them?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are not spreading their propaganda in the meetings, and, according to the by-laws, nothing of a political nature—

Senator McKELLAR. But this committee finds it at every turn.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not advocate those things yourself? You have not advocated them?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; I have not advocated them, and I would not advocate them, and they are not being advocated in the meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. You care for this Government and you believe in this Government, don't you?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. And if there are wrongs to be righted, you believe that they can be righted by the ballot?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you want to bring up your children in this country, and you believe that this is the land of great opportunity, and you are not in sympathy with those men who get into your organization for the purpose of boring from within and succeeded in breaking down the organization?

Mr. ANDERSON. But they are not succeeding in breaking down the organization. I can not see how a possible 250 or 300 men in the city of Gary, with a population of 75,000 men, is going to break down the entire organization as it stands to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that they hurt the work of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. They may hurt it. There is no question about that; but as long as they are not showing it, we can not question a man as to his religious affiliation or party affiliation when he applies for membership.

The CHAIRMAN. But you can question a man as to whether or not he is a loyal American citizen, can you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; we do.

The CHAIRMAN. And you can make your federation a federation of Americans, can you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. We do.

Senator McKELLAR. Yet we have had men up here before this committee and say they are against the Government, and say that they are advisers to the leaders of the strike. Mr. Margolis said that he was an attorney and an adviser for the leaders of this strike. He declares himself against the Government, he wants to be rid of the United States Government, and every other Government of the world. Why can't you get rid of that kind of man, and why do you go to those kind of men for advice?

Mr. ANDERSON. We do try to eliminate him——

Senator McKELLAR (continuing). Legal or any other kind of advice. Men like Foster and Margolis——

Mr. ANDERSON (interrupting). We never find these men until there is a strike.

Senator McKELLAR. You will find them in every meeting near a strike. They have done your strike cause more harm than all the rest of your troubles put together. These men like Foster and Margolis will do your cause more harm with the American people than any other one factor or all of the factors.

Mr. ANDERSON. The rank and file of the organization has not the power to oust these men or to elect them to office.

Senator McKELLAR. Why haven't they? Mr. Foster holds office under that organization. Do they go in there and take charge of the offices and elect themselves?

Mr. ANDERSON. They were appointed at the Federation meeting, not by the rank and file but by the delegates to that convention.

Senator McKELLAR. But the rank and file should get rid of the delegates, if they want those kind of men.

Mr. ANDERSON. You can not get the men you want always.

Senator McKELLAR. It is very unfortunate for the organization when you elect men like Foster and advisory fellows like Margolis.

Mr. ANDERSON. It takes time to make changes in the constitution or to unseat unfavorable officials. It has been tried out at different times to change the constitution, and sometimes it turns out favorably, but other times it does not. You have to wait another year until you get another chance.

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Anderson, you appear to be a fair and honest American citizen, and an honest believer in the right of labor, and standing up for the proper wage, and can not you see that when a man like Mr. Foster, with his views, is put in charge, virtually put in charge of the strike, as the secretary general of the strike, that he is doing your cause infinite harm, and men like you, good American citizens, like you, should take steps to remove a man like that from the position of power and influence.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say that I am opposed to anything like that, where it is doing our cause harm; but as I have already stated, these changes can not be brought about only at the proper time, in our conventions and special conferences.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you in the convention at Atlantic City?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Nor at Milwaukee in the year 1918?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been a member? When did you join the Amalgamated?

Mr. ANDERSON. I became a member of the Amalgamated, I believe, in September, 1918. September or October, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that you have already stated that so far as you are concerned, you would be willing to end the strike if you had an eight-hour day and living wages?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And most of the men feel the same way?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say that they do.

Senator McKELLAR. Do the American men who are in the strike, like yourself, pretty generally feel that way?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Just speaking for myself, and giving my own idea about the foreigners that we met, what I saw of them around Pittsburgh, I would say that they were very ignorant and know little of the things that are going on, and are just being led by the organizers. The Americans are not that way, of course.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not admit that they were being led around in this particular strike. I know that they are not in Gary, because they want the same things that I want, positively. If I had not personified in my actions, and if they had not wanted the same things that I wanted, exactly, certainly they never would have been satisfied to have me in the position that I am in.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you ever talked with your own companies' officers or their representatives in reference to establishing an eight-hour day, three shifts, and agreeing upon a scale of wages?

Mr. ANDERSON. The company officials, do you mean?

Senator McKELLAR. Yes; would not that be the sensible, every-day, American way of arranging the matter, for the representatives of labor to go to your employers and attempt at any rate to arrange an eight-hour day, with a living wage, if that can be done?

Mr. ANDERSON. If that can be done.

Senator McKELLAR. Would it not be well to try it?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been tried.

Senator McKELLAR. And it was turned out, it was tried without success.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know why the strike was not postponed when the President of the United States requested it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that the strike date was set for September 22, quite a long time ago, I would imagine several months, some time ago last summer, we took the strike vote up throughout the country in the steel industry, and voted to strike on the 22d of September unless Judge Gary consented to meet with our committee, and since he did not meet with out committee, the strike was called.

The CHAIRMAN. How was this committee selected to meet Judge Gary?

Mr. ANDERSON. This particular committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. I was not a member of the organization when this committee was selected. This committee is what is known as the organization committee.

The CHAIRMAN. But would they have a right to go ahead and hold a meeting without consulting anybody else?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; we had a conference in Chicago for those in Chicago last summer, and we decided before the representatives of the various organizations in the Chicago district demanded that they have representation, and that the demands, if there were any presented, must first be voted on by the rank and file. They had no authority to act without our consent.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean this particular committee, that tried to see Judge Gary, how was that committee selected?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say that I do not know how that committee was selected.

Senator McKELLAR. When the President wrote to Mr. Gompers, or telegraphed to Mr. Gompers, asking that the strike be postponed in view of the labor conference that was to be held there, was that submitted to you as one of the organizers of the strike; was that question submitted to you?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. I believe in Mr. Foster's testimony, or the testimony of some one else, it was stated that after a conference with Mr. Foster and Mr. Tighe and Mr. Fitzpatrick, that the President's request was turned down. Did you understand that that was what was done?

Mr. ANDERSON. Through the press we were given to understand that.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, the rank and file were not consulted at all about whether or not they should accede to the President's request, or to Mr. Gompers's request?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at that time; it was not.

Senator McKELLAR. And these three men just had absolute control?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; I would say that they did.

Senator WALSH. Some one, Mr. Gompers, or some one, claimed that the situation was such that the men were so restless, and their hearts were set upon the strike, that they could not have controlled the situation. I want to ask you if that situation existed at Gary generally?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. I want to submit—there is quite a little story connected with it. All during this organization campaign the employees who were active and who were considered as active in the organization campaign in Gary were being intimidated. Numbers and numbers of them were discharged for their union activities.

Senator WALSH. We have not got very much evidence of that. That suggestion has been made from time to time, but there has not been much evidence produced here of specific cases of that. I think I am correct about that.

Senator PHIPPS. You are correct, but Mr. Anderson testified that, although he was known to be a union man prior to September 22, he was kept on the roll until the strike was called.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was kept on the roll; I will admit that, but a number of others were discharged, but they contend they were being intimidated for being active in the organization.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know the names of any of those? Could you give them to us so we could look them up? I do not mean to doubt your word; I think you are giving us the facts.

Mr. ANDERSON. A particular friend of mine—I will cite you the instance—a Mr. Luchs, Mr. E. A. Luchs. He was working in the Merchant mills and was selected a delegate to the convention of this amalgamated association in Louisville in May. Two weeks previous to the day of the convention he notified his foreman he was going to this convention and would like to be off a couple of weeks. He said, "All right; go ahead." This is Mr. Luchs's statement to me. Luchs is a particular friend of mine, and I think he speaks the truth; at least, I am satisfied he does. He informed the foreman he would go. On the day previous to the day he was to leave for this particular point to attend the convention he told the foreman, "I am going to-morrow." The foreman said, "If you go to that convention it is not necessary for you to come back to work." He says, "All right; if that is the way you feel about it. I am going to this convention. I told you two weeks ago I wanted to go and you promised I could go, and therefore I am going," and he went to the convention, and has been refused employment since.

Senator McKELLAR. That was last May?

Mr. ANDERSON. That was last May.

Senator McKELLAR. That was a man named F. A. Luchs?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. What company did he work for?

Mr. ANDERSON. He worked for the Illinois Steel Co., Gary works.

Senator McKELLAR. That is one of what is commonly called the Steel Trust companies?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. That is one case. There are several other cases. I do not know the men personally, but I have come in contact with them since that time. I do not remember their names exactly, but there is a number of them. However, the men who are working in the mills became incensed at such treatment, and they were clamoring for a strike because they did not know what day they would be discharged. The man named Titus, previous to his becoming active in the organization, had been given turns as a first helper in the open hearth, and after that he never had a chance to get these extra turns. They were given to another man, and he did not know what day he was going to be discharged; he felt any day might be his last, and numbers of others were just in the same position; they were demanding that we call this strike before any more of our members were discharged.

Senator PHIPPS. The question Senator Walsh asked you was practically the one I had in mind. I want to state it again, please, and in a little different form. Suppose your officials of your lodges had said to the men, "At the request of President Wilson, it is desired to postpone the strike date from September 22 until after the labor



meeting in Washington on October 6," do you think the men would have disobeyed that request or would they still have gone out on the strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. They would have obeyed that request, I think. I am satisfied they would.

Senator WALSH. I want to ask you another question, Mr. Anderson. Some time ago in your testimony you started to say, in substance, "I do not think 300 men control the sentiment or views of a community of 30,000 people," having in mind that there was some un-American organization of about 300 men in Gary. To what did you refer, Mr. Anderson, I. W. W., Bolsheviks, or what?

Mr. ANDERSON. I referred to what is known as the Reds.

Senator WALSH. And do you say to this committee, as a patriotic American citizen, that, so far as you know later conditions in Gary, there are not more than 300? I myself think that is a great number, but there are not more than 300 Reds in Gary?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think there are over 300.

Senator WALSH. Have they a well-recognized society, with officers and meetings?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not to my knowledge.

Senator WALSH. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir. The Socialistic Party, they have meeting places.

Senator PHIPPS. That is a political organization?

Mr. ANDERSON. But so far as the I. W. W. and the so-called Reds are concerned, if they have any meeting places there I do not know where they are.

Senator WALSH. So far as the Reds took part in politics; or have taken part in politics, they belong to the Socialistic Party, do they not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, if they take part in politics—

Senator WALSH. I do not mean to say all Socialists, by any means, are Reds, but they seem to line with that organization, if any?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not always. The great majority of them do not line with any political party at all.

Senator McKELLAR. They vote for anything that will kick up a row.

The CHAIRMAN. The most of them do not vote, I imagine.

Senator WALSH. I was somewhat impressed with your remark that these men got into your organizations and you do not discover their radicalism until a strike or something of that kind turns up. Is that a fact?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. What the Senators had in mind when they were discussing the lack of public sentiment, or the difficulty under which you were laboring in this strike by reason of not having public sentiment, was the fact that the public, I think, when they read the story of a man like this lawyer that was here, Margolis, and Taylor, that they have many followers; that they have many sympathizers; that they are a bad apple in the barrel, and it would lead to very great destruction of fundamental American principles. Among workmen I think there is a general feeling in America that labor owes it to itself to stamp that out rapidly and thoroughly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. While the great number of these people who are classified as Bolsheviks, and anarchists, and Reds are to a great extent considered—well, just a common expression, as a little loose upstairs. That is the way they are considered by the average member of the American Federation of Labor.

Senator WALSH. There seems to be existing a persistent—there seems to be an atmosphere, whether put on purposely or not I will not say, to have it appear that this is a strike promoted and carried out by radical extremists.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; that is the purpose of the press of this country. I have noted it especially in Gary. I know Gary. I am well satisfied that I know the city of Gary as well as the average citizen, and I do know that there was nothing in Gary to warrant such ridiculous stories as appeared in the newspapers. I know that men's houses were broken into by the military authorities, and it was reported that firearms and tons of Red literature was taken from these homes, which I know for a positive fact was absolutely untrue. Now, this same Paul Glaser, he lives way out in the country, what is considered out in the country from Gary, and the military authorities and the city police went out to his home, after midnight, after Gen. Wood came into Gary, and I was before Gen. Wood about around 12 o'clock, and they were out there after I had been up before Gen. Wood, and they broke the door in and went into his house expecting to find it full of ammunition and guns, and liquor, and one thing and another, and what they found in there was two old pistols and a revolver that was still usable, but as a matter of fact I would not give 50 cents for all three of them. Then, I doubt whether he had any ammunition at all of any kind, and all the liquor they found was a jug with some grape juice that had soured, and they carried away from that house one little booklet written by Jack London.

Senator WALSH. Are there any mills in Gary except those of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not unless the Bolt and Screw Works.

Senator WALSH. Not of any consequence?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not of any consequence. There was the American Bridge Co., the American Tin Plate, and the Illinois Steel Co. All three of them are owned and controlled by the United States Steel Corporation.

Senator WALSH. I understood you to say that about 76 per cent of employees are out on strike now. How many does that represent in numbers? Perhaps you have told us before.

Mr. ANDERSON. In numbers I would say, that is estimating 18,000 as being the total number, I would say there is about 14,000 of them still on strike, about. Somewhere around that number.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further with this witness?

Senator PHIPPS. I believe not, unless Lieut. Van Buren, who has heard this statement, wishes to now make any response to it. I confess I was reading something else and did not follow the statement very closely.

Senator WALSH. He was talking about the numbers on strike.

Senator PHIPPS. But as to breaking in homes at Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further, Mr. Anderson, you would like to say to the committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know at this time. I wish to say this. It may be of interest, that when this strike was called, or a few days previous to the calling of this strike, we went to the mayor, a committee of our steel council went to the mayor and explained to him just how we were going to conduct this strike in the way of maintaining a picket line in order to preserve law and order. We promised him we would cooperate with him in every way to preserve law and order, and we did so up until Saturday night, that was October 4, October 3 or 4, Saturday evening, there was a meeting out at the park, an open-air meeting, and while the crowd was coming home, going south from this park, there was a street car stopped, while a train was crossing the street, and a negro was on it and somehow or other there was a fight started on this car.

I was not there, and I can not say how it was started, but a fight was started on this car, and various stories have been brought in as to what occurred, but I am just simply stating the fight occurred in this street car, this particular car, and machine loads of men were brought from the steel plant, not only officially recognized watchmen but also men who were being used as strike breakers, came down, and with clubs in their hands they struck right and left, and about 32 people were arrested, and it was pictured as a riot, and the city was running in blood, and as a matter of fact there was only one man injured at all, and he had his head tied up. I saw him later. He was able to walk around at all times. On this information the militia was brought into Gary, and as a protest against the militia being brought into Gary, the ex-soldiers then had returned from France, returned out of the Regular Army, started a parade of their own; there was about 250 or possibly 300 of these men in uniform started to march down the street or up Broadway, rather, and a crowd followed them. The man who was leading these soldiers did not know where to take them to disperse them, so they would break up peaceably, and marched them all around town and back and forth across Broadway, and finally landed them in the park, and there they were dispersed and all went home peaceably, and there was a great noise made over this affair in the newspapers and also by the mayor, that it was a Bolshevik uprising, etc., and there was absolutely nothing to it. Three of these ex-soldiers were before Gen. Wood that night, and all three of them were as good American citizens as anyone. I question anyone being a better American citizen than they were, from their actions and from their words concerning what they had done over in France, and these men were not criticized by Gen. Wood to any great extent, only that they were to remove their uniforms, and in the proclamation it was stated specifically that no man was allowed to wear a uniform unless he was actively serving the Regular Army, or would voluntarily act on special duty while the troops were in Gary.

Senator WALSH. Do you not think that was a good proclamation. in view of the fact that there should be a distinction between who was there in the performance of public duty and those that were not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say it was.

Senator WALSH. I am not saying whether the original order to bring troops in was justified or not, but after they were once in there.

it seems to me, in order to confine the wearing of uniform to only those men on duty was a very proper measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say it was a good thing that it was contained in the order.

I want to say further that men wearing the uniform of the United States soldier were used as guards at the Inland Steel Plant; they were also used in Gary before the troops came there, and rode around in automobiles, and whenever they came where there was a crowd of people they jumped out of the machines and started clubbing right and left. I have seen them do it; this is not hearsay; I saw them with my own eyes.

Senator WALSH. Who were these?

Mr. ANDERSON. They were men, some of them sworn in as deputies or special police; others were voluntarily acting in that capacity.

Senator WALSH. They were men who had authority, although they may have misused it?

Mr. ANDERSON. They had authority and misused it.

The CHAIRMAN. Was anybody killed there during that strike?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir. The worst that ever happened at Gary, an automobile ran over one of our pickets and broke his leg in two places, and that was the worst that ever happened in Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had no disorder since the soldiers came?

Mr. ANDERSON. Before nor since, except this little fight we had on Saturday evening, and there was not as much disturbance there as would ordinarily occur in a saloon when two or three men would be fighting.

Senator WALSH. Who could give us a good report on that? Could Gen. Wood do it. He was not there, but probably made an investigation since.

Mr. ANDERSON. Gen. Wood could give the same information as I am giving you, or some one else who saw it or heard about it. I did not see this particular fight, but immediately after the report came in, when I was standing in a building on Broadway and looking down the street, I saw several loads of men going down there, and I immediately followed in another machine to see what the disturbance was, and I got down there and the special officers, some of them were in civilian clothes and some were in uniform of United States soldiers, were clubbing the people right and left. I saw that.

Senator WALSH. I beg pardon for breaking up your argument. You may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. And it was then, and just as soon as the militia came into Gary, or rather the Regular Army, came into Gary preceded them by several hours, and I was called before the Intelligence Department, I believe the first man in Gary to be called, I am not sure of that, but I think so, and later Gen. Wood read his proclamation to me, and these three soldiers and a man by the name of Dietrich, who is president of the Central Labor Union, that is a building trades organization in Gary, and later there were other men arrested, or rather brought before the Intelligence Department, some of them had their homes broken into, others were apprehended in various ways; a number of them went voluntarily when they heard there were warrants out for them, or at least an order for their arrest, they went voluntarily to the Intelligence Department.

Senator WALSH. Were you arrested?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not arrested.

Senator WALSH. You were requested to come to headquarters?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was requested to come before Gen. Wood.

Senator WALSH. You say other officers went out to get other men and arrest them. I thought you said broke into their houses, and so forth. Were any arrested by the Intelligence Department?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; there were some men arrested by the Intelligence Department.

Senator WALSH. Do you not mean that they were sent for and summoned to come?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir; several of them were confined in the jail; the city jail.

Senator WALSH. After they told their story or before?

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not say whether before or after. I would not say.

Senator WALSH. So that in your case you were simply summoned to come—I mean requested to come?

Mr. ANDERSON. Requested.

Senator WALSH. At the same time, or soon after, subpoenas or warrants were sent out and men arrested or brought in?

Mr. ANDERSON. In some cases they were arrested; in others, just simply summoned the same as I had been. One case in particular, the man told me the Intelligence Department was looking for him, and I told him to go up there and see what they wanted, and he did, and he said they had been looking for him; they admitted they had been looking for him. Whether they had a warrant for him or not I would not state, but men were arrested and were brought before the Intelligence Department. I know that. We had four pickets arrested and brought before Col. Mapes, and they admitted they had been engaged in an attack upon a man. They had not hurt him, but they just simply attempted to do it; had not got away with it. This man happened to be a detective, and he pulled a gun on them and arrested them, and they admitted their guilt and were confined several days.

Senator PHIPPS. You have recited the occurrence of the night of October 4 growing out of a fight on a street car. You saw what followed after that. I believe you also stated that you had seen deputies drive up in a machine and attack a crowd of people on the street, club them?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; I saw them on Sunday following this Saturday night.

Senator PHIPPS. Following Sunday night?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. That was following the occurrence of the street car?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. The day following. Had the mayor issued any proclamation in the meantime prohibiting the assemblage of crowds on the streets, or do you know?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know of any such occurrence as that prior to this date of October 4?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Everything had been peaceable up to the night of October 4, as I understand?

Mr. ANDERSON. Absolutely; to the best of my knowledge. There may have started fights among one or two men, or something like that, but nobody was arrested, or it was never brought to my attention.

Senator PHIPPS. You were present in the room while Lieut. Van Buren was testifying as to the activities of the Intelligence Bureau, operating under the direction of Gen. Leonard Wood. Following that testimony, were any statements made by Lieut. Van Buren to which you take exception, or which you believe were inaccurate as to the method of locking up these men, taking them to headquarters. Is there any instance where they were jailed before they were questioned or given a hearing?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not to my knowledge. What I take exception to in his statement was the fact that he had opened tons of literature of this so-called Red literature. I question that—

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, different citizens' estimation of what would constitute a ton of printed matter would vary, but, in your opinion, were there thousands of copies of these different books and papers?

Mr. ANDERSON. No doubt there were thousands of them, but as to tons I would question that. However, the papers, the Gary papers and the Chicago papers, made this assertion that when this man's—Paul Glaser's—house was raided, they opened tons of literature. Now, the literature taken out of his house did not weigh more than this envelope right here.

Senator PHIPPS. That is what the newspapers stated. Lieut. Van Buren did not state that in his testimony?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. The lieutenant stated that men were not apprehended on a first notice or statement of their activities; that they were checked up before anyone was taken into custody. Now I, unfortunately, did not hear all of your recital of that particular case, where you stated that the door was broken, or the house was broken into, and a search made for literature and resulted in the finding of one publication only.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do you want we to state that?

Senator PHIPPS. I can probably get it from the record; but does it differ from the statements made by Lieut. Van Buren in any important particular?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe he mentioned that particular case; but I want to say one thing. I don't believe Lieut. Van Buren mentioned anything about this particular case, but a man was before the immigration authorities in Gary yesterday and the day before yesterday, and it was brought out by the city authorities as having been reported that this man had participated in this so-called May Day celebration. Now, this particular man, it was brought out in the testimony, happened to be in Coblenz, Germany, when this particular May Day affair was pulled off. Now, such statements as that, played up by the newspapers, give false impressions, and there is no truth in the matter, like this man that is now before the immigration authorities; and if it is proven that he was in Coblenz, Ger-

many, instead of Gary, on May 4, certainly the testimony will be discredited. But the newspapers did not take the trouble to make any such statements, and the result is that the people in general who read the papers generally will take that as evidence that this is a Red movement in Gary, and it is not an A. F. of L. strike but a Red movement. That is what I am protesting against, and the way this is being investigated at the present time, instead of forcing the newspapers to either not print anything at all, if they do not print the truth. They are permitted to continue their propaganda, and we are being discredited when we are not guilty.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, that is something that Government bodies even can not control up to date, let alone an investigating committee.

But I want to know whether or not there was any particular exception to anything testified to by Lieut. Van Buren, and whether or not you felt after hearing his testimony that he had made a fair statement of the activities of his investigating bureau since October 6 in Gary. You state one instance that he did not refer to, that he possibly has no knowledge of. The immigration bureau, of course, is not under his control.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe that it was mentioned in his report that some of these homes had been entered at a late hour at night, which I believe could have been done easily without waking up the family and scaring them. I know of one instance where a man's home was raided. His name is Anthony J. Sinnott. Anthony J. Sinnott was born and raised in this country, and his wife was about to have a child, and his home was raided, and it may have resulted in something very serious. Now, it was not necessary, I don't believe, to raid that man's house at that hour of the night; it could have been accomplished just as well in the day time.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know what hour of the night it was?

Mr. ANDERSON. It was 11 o'clock, or late at any rate. She had already retired.

Senator PHIPPS. They may have desired to choose an hour when they thought it was likely they would find the owner of the home there.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I would like to state that all the I. W. W.'s we got at night. That was about the only time we could find them in. We held our investigating court, so called, until about 5 o'clock or 5.30 o'clock in the morning, at one particular time. They were summoned at night and put under interrogation.

Senator PHIPPS. Was Sinnott one of the men?

Lieut. VAN BUREN. I do not remember the name. Was that a labor case or a Red case?

Mr. RODENBERRY. It was a Red case.

Lieut. VAN BUREN. There were a lot of cases of illicit stills which were going on. That was something I was not interested in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything you desire to say, Mr. Anderson?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, and we will hear other witnesses in the morning at 10 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 5.40 p. m., the committee took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, October 25, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)





# INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1919.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 o'clock a. m., in Room 201, Senate Office Building, Hon. William S. Kenyon presiding.

Present: Senators Kenyon (chairman), Sterling, and Phipps.

Also present: William B. Rubin, counsel for strike committee; William J. Rattenbury, rail straightener, Gary, Ind.

## TESTIMONY OF MR. WILLIAM J. RATTENBURY.

(William J. Rattenbury was thereupon called as a witness, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

Mr. RATTENBURY. William J. Rattenbury.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is your office, Mr. Rattenbury?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Gary, Ind.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Steel worker.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you worked there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Almost 11 years.

The CHAIRMAN. What particular part of the work were you doing at the time of the strike?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I was a rail straightener.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men were employed in those mills?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Why, I could only guess at that; they say all the way from twelve to twenty thousand, but I should say around fifteen or sixteen thousand in the whole Gary plant.

The CHAIRMAN. What were the conditions in the mills before the strike? Was there any complaint about conditions?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; the complaint, the chief complaint, was the long hours.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of the workmen worked eight hours?

Mr. RATTENBURY. None. There was a few in the tin plate who worked, where it is very hot, but there are only a very few of them who worked eight hours, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of them worked 10 hours?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The shopmen, the mechanics, like the electrical shops and the foundries, and the machine shops.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us any idea of the proportion of the total number who worked 10 hours?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I do not believe I could. Perhaps 10 or 15 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps 10 or 15 per cent?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir; perhaps 10 or 15 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. And the balance worked 12 hours?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Twelve hours. I am only guessing at that, because I have no means of knowing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your judgment that the larger proportion of the men there worked 12 hours?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And is that the main complaint?

Mr. RATTENBURY. That is the main complaint.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, there was not much complaint about wages?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; everybody seemed to be fairly well satisfied with the wages at 12 hours, but, of course, there would have been complaint if they were reduced to 8 hours at the same rate; we would hardly be able to live on it then.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you demanding 8 hours with the 12-hour pay, or are you demanding an 8-hour day with a living wage?

Mr. RATTENBURY. My understanding of that was that that part of it was to be negotiated if they got to the company.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not asking for a 12-hour day with 8 hours work—12 hours pay?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are asking for a living wage—

Mr. RATTENBURY (interrupting). We are asking for a living wage, a wage necessary to maintain the American standard of livelihood.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the housing conditions in Gary? There was something said about that yesterday.

Mr. RATTENBURY. The housing plant is good, very good. I, myself, am living in a company house, and have been ever since I have been there, and I must say that I am very much satisfied with that part of it. I wish that the company owned all the houses that are for rent; I would rather have the company own them than to have private interests own them.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of the houses occupied there are owned by the company?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Do you mean the whole of Gary?

The CHAIRMAN. No; I mean occupied by workers in the mill?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, a very small proportion.

The CHAIRMAN. A small proportion?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; 5 per cent, hardly that.

The CHAIRMAN. And where do the other workers live who do not occupy the company houses?

Mr. RATTENBURY. They have to pay enormous rents, except for the foreign element, and some of those live out in the outskirts, and some live in shacks.

The CHAIRMAN. And this plan of the company of building and owning the homes you think is a very good idea?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir; I do. There is only one objection that I have to that, and that is you have to be good in the eyes of the company or you can not get that. You have to be O. K. all the way through.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by being good?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, if they thought that you were not exactly loyal, or if you were a kicker in any way, the probability is you would not get it.

The CHAIRMAN. You are on strike now?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are still occupying one of the houses of the company?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I am still occupying one of their houses.

The CHAIRMAN. And the fact that you are a striker, has that affected you in any way?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Not in my personal case; no. I paid my rent the other day, and they accepted it all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any others—

Mr. RATTENBURY. From first-hand knowledge I do not. I heard that some of them were ordered out, but I could not swear to that.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of these men in the Gary mills are unionized?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, I would say 80 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. How many, 80 per cent?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I am only making a guess at that.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us your best judgment.

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of the men in the mills have gone out on the strike?

Mr. RATTENBURY. They must have went out 90 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. And what proportion are there out now?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, I could not say. I think Mr. Anderson probably was about right yesterday when he said 75 or 76 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. And of these men who have gone out, what percentage of them, can you say, are not American citizens?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, I could not say that, either. I could not tell. Of course, the big percentage of the employees are Europeans. How many of them are naturalized, I have no way of knowing.

The CHAIRMAN. In the 11 years that you have been working there, has this proportion of European labor increased or decreased?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Do you mean my remuneration?

The CHAIRMAN. No; what proportion of European labor? Has it increased or decreased? Are there more of them coming in from abroad all the time?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I think not so much since the war.

The CHAIRMAN. But before the war?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Before the war; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been increasing?

Mr. RATTENBURY. It has been increasing.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how they were brought in—who brought them in?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I have no personal knowledge of it, except I talked with them and they say it was advertised over in Europe, the good conditions that obtained here, so they could come.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, in this country generally?

Mr. RATTENBURY. In this country generally.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were those advertisements by? Do you know?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not know that.

The CHAIRMAN. By the different industries? Did the different industries advertise in Europe or the Government?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not understand that it was the Government, but the employing interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The employing interests?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard the testimony here yesterday of Lieut. Van Buren?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen anything of this, what is termed Red literature, out there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, no; I have not. I have seen radical literature, but not of the types he has.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know about these different societies that he speaks of out there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; all I know of is the Socialist societies.

The CHAIRMAN. You know of the Socialist societies?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The Socialist locals and different nationalities.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a good deal of this spirit that he speaks of out there among the men?

Mr. RATTENBURY. My opinion is that that Red—that—they are pressing very heavily on this Red situation. I believe that it is exaggerated in all proportion to the facts. There is no doubt there are some Reds. Of course, I hardly know how you would define a Red. It is a sort of a ghost that they have conjured up since the strike came on, and I believe it has done a good deal to discredit the movement. I know that this strike is an American Federation of Labor strike, and it has nothing to do with the I. W. W. or any radical organization whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that the I. W. W. are in it, and are helping it along?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The I. W. W. have not very much use for the American Federation of Labor. They use the American Federation of Labor—they make fun of it and say that it is not efficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you many I. W. W.'s at Gary?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not know that.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know that or do not know of any?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I could not say that I know of any.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you understand the strike to be largely for the eight-hour day?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the question of complaints, the presentation of complaints? Do you have any opportunity to present complaints?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir. Of course, a personal complaint, one could go to his superior, go to his foreman, and could tell his complaint; but it was very seldom it was looked into; that has been my experience. The minute you go to some one higher up, then the fellow below him don't like it; they do not like you going over their heads. See?

The CHAIRMAN. And do you think that if it had not been for the long-hour day that there would not have been any strike?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not believe there would have been any strike.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you think that that is really the fundamental—

Mr. RATTENBURY. Of course, the strikers, those who have joined the union, also want some protection in the way of a union. They want to be able to have not only an eight-hour day, but they want to also secure the collective bargaining.

The CHAIRMAN. They want collective bargaining?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand that collective bargaining must mean bargaining through a union?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Through the union, or through the workers' appointed representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. How would the non-union men reach the company in collective bargaining?

Mr. RATTENBURY. They would not have any chance to.

The CHAIRMAN. Your theory is that unionism is necessary to carry out the plan of collective bargaining?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in your opinion does unionizing of a mill or a plant mean a closed plant?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir; my understanding is while the bosses have injected that into this movement, that the closed shop is not part of it at all.

The CHAIRMAN. If you do not have the closed shop, how would the nonunion men present their grievances through collective bargaining?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, by joining the union; and, of course, if they were organized in sufficient numbers, and had collective bargaining, they would have a chance to go and make the complaints in the proper place; the conditions would be improved for the non-union men as well as the union men. The condition would obtain, no doubt, for those who were not in the union as well.

The CHAIRMAN. And they have not any complaint about the safety appliances?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I believe, so far as I know, they have pretty fair precautions.

The CHAIRMAN. And your complaint is limited to the two things, the hours of service—

Mr. RATTENBURY (interrupting). The hours of service.

The CHAIRMAN. And the right to be represented, as you understand it, through unionization?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And those are the two things that the strike is about, in your judgment?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Rattenbury, you are a native-born citizen?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir; I am a Canadian by birth; I am a naturalized citizen, though.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Almost 11 years. I will be 11 years next January.

Senator STERLING. You, then, came from Canada almost directly to the steelworks?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I came from Canada to Chicago first, and then I got a job out in Gary, and I have been working there ever since.

Senator STERLING. And your particular work is what?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Rail straightener.

Senator STERLING. How much do you get per day?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I have no day rate; it is tonnage.

Senator STERLING. Well, what does it amount to, per day?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Why, lately I have been making about \$12.

Senator STERLING. About \$12 a day?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir; some days I make more, and some days, if there is a breakdown, you will possibly not make anything.

Senator STERLING. Well, then, you average about \$12 a day?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I have since the last raise.

Senator STERLING. Since the last raise, which was when?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, about 10 months ago, I guess; or perhaps a year ago.

Senator STERLING. That is a pretty good wage, isn't it, \$12 a day?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I have not any complaint with the wage. Of course, it must be understood—I would like to make this clear—that when the last raise came it was on the basic eight-hour day.

Senator STERLING. And time and a half for overtime?

Mr. RATTENBURY. And time and a half for overtime, over the 8 hours, which means that I am getting paid for a 14-hour day.

Now, if we was to go back to eight hours, you see I would lose six hours' work.

Senator STERLING. Well, do you work continuously during the 12 hours?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Why, sometimes, yes; and sometimes it depends on how the steel comes. If there is work to do I work continuously.

Senator STERLING. Well, you take it day by day, now, in the course of your work there you have intervals, of course, in which you do not work?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There are some intervals, yes. There are some days, however, that there is hardly an interval. That is very occasional, I will say.

Senator STERLING. That is at long intervals?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator STERLING. When there is a day when there is no let-up?

Mr. RATTENBURY. When there is no let-up.

Senator STERLING. But, as a general thing, there is a let-up?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There is a let-up.

Senator STERLING. How many hours during the 12 hours is there a let-up in the work?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, probably a couple of hours.

Senator STERLING. Probably a couple of hours?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. So that, as a general thing, it amounts to about 10 hours' work?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; but the worker has to be there all this time.

Senator STERLING. That is true, but there is not that physical exertion for more than about 10 hours.

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; but I do not believe there is any man living that could do it, to work continuously for 12 hours and live. I believe that our health is saved by the fact that occasionally there is a breakdown or there is times when there is nothing to do, and the mill is shut down, sometimes for three months at a time, and we have a chance to build up our physique, our wasted energy. In the 11 years that I have been there, if I had to work the 12 hours continuously every day without shutting down, I am sure that I would not be living now.

Senator STERLING. What other employment or occupation have you followed other than your work in the steel mill?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, I worked at many things.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever work on a farm?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I have worked on a farm.

Senator STERLING. How many hours per day did you put in while doing farm work?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, the hours they put in were pretty long, sir.

Senator STERLING. They range from 12 to 14 hours per day, don't they?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; but that is nothing compared with the steel mill. They have not the heat and especially like in my job. My particular work is the heaviest work in the steel mills.

Senator STERLING. How many men are employed in your—

Mr. RATTENBURY. At my craft?

Senator STERLING. At your craft in the steel mill where you work?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, there is about 25.

Senator STERLING. About 25, out of how many, all told?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Out of—I suppose they run 350 or 400 in that department.

Senator STERLING. And about how many of what you term rail straighteners are there in the plant at Gary?

Senator PHIPPS. There is just one rail mill there, isn't there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There is just one rail mill there.

Senator STERLING. And how many of the rail straighteners are there in the rail mill?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, there are some extras.

Senator STERLING. But the regular men in the regular work?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Of the regular men, of the regular work, it is about 12 on each shift, about 24.

Senator STERLING. About 24 men?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; that works regular, and there are some extras.

Senator STERLING. There are about 24 men that work regularly, at the work you do in the straightening of the rails?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you belong to the union?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir; I belong to the union.

Senator STERLING. What is your union?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The Iron, Steel and Tin Workers' Amalgamated.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been a member of the union?

Mr. RATTENBURY. About a year.

Senator STERLING. Had you ever belonged to any other organization—workmen's organization?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir; this was the first time that I was ever in the labor union.

Senator STERLING. You say that you heard Mr. Van Buren's testimony—Lieut. Van Buren's testimony?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you have no reason to disbelieve his testimony, as to what he found out in regard to the I. W. W. organizations?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I could not discredit it, because I was not there and do not know; but I do believe that the press, that the city government, and that the steel makers have done all they could to make it appear that this union movement was a radical movement.

Senator STERLING. You heard the specific reports read yesterday, did you?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Referring to individuals who had been questioned in regard to their affiliations with the different organizations?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know William Z. Foster?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not know him; no, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of his having been at Gary?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I know he was there. I did not—

Senator STERLING (interposing). When was he there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. He was there when first started to organize, about a year ago; I do not believe he has been there since.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of his having held some meetings there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; I believe he did address a meeting there—I think only once.

Senator STERLING. Do you know something about his antecedents, and to what organizations he belonged?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Only through the press?

Senator STERLING. Only through the press, and through the press you know that he was an I. W. W. leader?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I know that he was accused of being.

Senator STERLING. And he was a contributor to their papers?

Mr. RATTENBURY. That is what the press say; that is all I know.

Senator STERLING. You know that Mr. Foster is one of the first leaders in this strike movement, do you not?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you consider him a radical?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not know that he is. All I know about the man is what the daily press says.

Senator STERLING. The press describes him as a radical of the worst kind, do they not?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, yes.

Senator STERLING. And you say all you know about him is what the press says?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you disbelieve what the press says about his I. W. W. affiliations and having been an I. W. W.?



Mr. RATTENBURY. I, of couse, do not know anything about the matter, but I do know that the press has lied about our movement.

Senator STERLING. You know that the press has described him as at least an industrial revolutionist, don't you?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And do you believe in that yourself?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I believe—

Senator STERLING (interposing). In industrial revolution?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I believe in the political action to cure all our grievances.

Senator STERLING. You believe in political action?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You believe that you can accomplish what you desire to accomplish for the benefit of the workers—

Br. RATTENBURY (interrupting). Through the ballot.

Senator STERLING. Through the ballot?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You do not believe that the workmen, through committees, should take possession of and manage the various industries of the country?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No.

Senator STERLING. You do not believe in that?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. You spoke about difficulty in getting your complaints heard. Now, did you ever make any complaints to your immediate superior, your foreman, for example, of anything about the management of the mill, in any way?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How many are there under the foreman, how many workmen are there? Are the rail straighteners all under one foreman?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; the finishing department, in which the rail straighteners work, are under a foreman.

Senator STERLING. And how many men are there under that foreman?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Why, something over a hundred.

Senator STERLING. Something over a hundred?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And of what conditions did you complain to the foreman?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, I will give you one instance. Last year, before the armistice, and up until the 1st of the year, they urged very much to work every day and not lose any time. The posted notices throughout the mill, and they said "Work every day and lick the Kaiser."

Senator STERLING. Let me ask you right there. You know the reason for that, do you not?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; I do.

Senator STERLING. There was a very great demand at that time, was not there, for full production?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; I am not complaining about it.

Senator STERLING. Because of the emergency?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; and I am not complaining about it. It is just necessary to my story.

Senator STERLING. All right.

Mr. RATTENBURY. Now, we worked Sundays.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. RATTENBURY. I had not lost a Sunday up until Christmas, and from the time that that Sunday work went into effect. I worked every day. I was probably the steadiest man they had there in my craft.

Senator STERLING. I can well believe it, sir.

Mr. RATTENBURY. And Christmas time came, and I had visitors to visit me, relatives whom I had not seen for 10 years. The next Sunday after Christmas I was ordered out to work. I told the foreman that I had relatives at my place; that I had not had a chance to visit with them, and I would like to have a Sunday off. He said, "Well, I am told to say no to to no one; everybody must be out." "Now," I said, "I am going to lay off to-morrow, but if you are short you call me up on the telephone and I won't see you stuck."

Senator STERLING. And that to-morrow was Sunday?

Mr. RATTENBURY. That was Sunday. He said, "All right," and I did not come out. When I came out Monday I was called in before the superintendent in charge of the department—that is, the next one over the foreman—and he asked me why I did not come out, and I told him. I told him I had explained it to the foreman; and he laid me off for a week, the first time in all the years that I had been there that I had been laid off.

Senator STERLING. And did you explain fully to him your understanding with the foreman?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I did, sir.

Senator STERLING. And did you make any complaint then to anybody higher up?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No.

Senator STERLING. You spoke as though the ignoring of your requests for complaints was a frequent occurrence. There were other instances where you made complaints or requested some liberties?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, personally I have not had much conflict with them on that particular line. That is about the only time that I had trouble.

Senator STERLING. That is about the only time that you had trouble?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Of course, I had a little personal difference, but I could not recall—

Senator STERLING. But those were not serious, were they?

Mr. RATTENBURY. They were not serious; but it only goes to show how impotent we are without some organization to present our claims. If I went over that man's head to his superior he would have been sore at me and made me suffer for it.

Senator STERLING. Senator Kenyon asked you, now, in regard to the collective bargaining, and I think you left it to be drawn from your statement that those who did not enter the union would have no chance under the collective-bargaining system. Is that right?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Why, I hardly see how they could present their case unless it was through some organization.

Senator STERLING. Would not the natural effect of that be to force men into the union, although they might find other reasons or believe they had other good reasons for not joining the union?

Mr. RATTENBURY. It probably would be an incentive to them to join the union, but I do not say it would be necessary at all.

Senator STERLING. Under a system of collective bargaining would not those who declined to join the union act through committees?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Well, then—

Senator STERLING (interposing). Without joining the union and paying the dues required to be paid to the union and observing the rules and regulations of the union, could not they appoint a committee and present their case, and could not they make a collective bargain in that way?

Mr. RATTENBURY. That would be, in effect, I should say, a union. Of course, it would be helpful, but it would be a drawing together, which they object to.

Senator STERLING. But you would not bar them from doing that, would you?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. As a union man, or as nonunion men, they could accomplish their collective bargaining in that way? What proportion of the men at Gary do you think are foreigners?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Oh, that is pretty hard to say. I would guess about 70 per cent, probably.

Senator STERLING. And you have been 11 years at Gary?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And the great proportion of the strikers are foreigners, as a matter of fact, are they not?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by that—unnaturalized citizens, when you speak of foreigners?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by foreigners?

Mr. RATTENBURY. One who was not born in this country. Of course, I have particular regard to those who come from Europe, the non-English speaking class.

The CHAIRMAN. You call a foreigner the non-English speaking people?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And you think that there are 65 or 70 per cent?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I make that guess.

The CHAIRMAN. Out of 10,000 workers?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You would not class yourself as a foreigner?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I would not; I had not any intention to convey that idea.

Senator STERLING. Could you say about what proportion of those foreigners are Hungarians or Austro-Hungarians?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I could not.

Senator STERLING. Is there quite a large proportion?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir; and Croats, Slovaks. Of course, they are divided up into many small kingdoms over there, and I could not differentiate them; but from that part of Europe, the Balkans, there are very many; and also Poles.

Senator STERLING. Are there many Serbians?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And Croatians?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And Slovaks?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And Russians?

Mr. RATTENBURY. And Russians.

Senator STERLING. And quite a large proportion are Russians, are they not?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There are quite a lot of Russians, and I would say that there were more Polish than any other one particular nationality.

Senator STERLING. You know something, do you not, of the ideas, socially and politically, which those people have had in Europe, especially the Russians recently, do you not?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And do you know also that these men would be easily influenced by such a man as Mr. Foster and other leaders, by appeals that such men could make, could not they?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Why, I suppose Mr. Foster, with the organizing ability that he must have, would have an influence.

Senator STERLING. And he would have a great influence on men of that kind?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I think, however, Mr. Foster's influence would not be so great, because he could not speak their language.

Senator STERLING. Any radical leader would have some influence on men of that class—the Hungarians, Croatians, and Russians—any man, whether he is an American leader or any other leader? Would an American leader have more influence—

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I do not think so.

Senator STERLING. You say that a great proportion of the strikers are foreigners?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Foreigners?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; but I do not believe that the great proportion are radicals by any means, because they have proved that in their voting.

Senator STERLING. But that is where, while you say a great proportion of them—while you do not think a great proportion of them are radicals—but that is where you find the most radicals?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; there are a percentage of radicals; yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you hold any office in your particular lodge?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Local? Yes, sir; I am treasurer of the roll-mill local.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you been paying any strike benefits up to date?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No strike benefits. We have relieved some who needed it out of our local's funds.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there not a rule of the American Federation of Labor, or the internationals that are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, that strike benefits shall be paid after a strike has been in operation for a certain length of time?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There is a provision that a member, when he is in the organization six months, is entitled to the strike benefits if the strike is a strike that is recognized by the national officials. Of course, if the strike should be local, and the president did not recognize it, they would not be entitled to the benefits.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you take any part in the organizing of the men?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. At Gary?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You say that you are not acquainted with Mr. W. Z. Foster. Do you know Mr. John Fitzpatrick?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No.

Senator PHIPPS. Has he been at Gary?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I believe he has been there a couple of times; I never heard him.

The CHAIRMAN. And is there anything further now that you desire to say, Mr. Rattenbury? If so, we would be glad to hear from you.

Mr. RUBIN. Do you want to testify about the conduct of the militia and the soldiers?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Why, I might say in regard to the soldiers that that riot, while I was not there to see it, I inquired a great deal about it; and it is very, very much exaggerated. That was before the soldiers came, before the regular soldiers came; but while the militia was there. No; the militia was not there. That was the cause of calling the militia, but there was an improvement out there on account of the saloons——

The CHAIRMAN. You mean to say that you got along better without the saloons?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Much better; much better.

The CHAIRMAN. That is some argument for prohibition, then.

Mr. RATTENBURY. I am glad to see it done away with.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not had much disorder while the soldiers have been there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But before that, did you?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No mass disorder. There has been lots of arrests.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any complaint about the way the soldiers have acted?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Not about the soldiers, but the militia.

The CHAIRMAN. The militia?

Mr. RATTENBURY. And the greatest complaint we have is the special deputies, special policemen, that were sworn in by the mayor right after the strike was called. They are the ones who raided Paul Glaser's house. I saw that myself. I did not see the raiding, but I was there the next day, and I saw what happened. They smashed his door in and broke his windows, and it was all broken up.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had your meetings right along, and you have had no suppression of free speech there?

Mr. RATTENBURY. We have had indoor——

The CHAIRMAN. Indoor meetings?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Indoor meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. And there has been no limitation on that in any way?

Mr. RATTENBURY. It has been limited to the English language.

Senator STERLING. That is, the speeches must be made in English?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The speeches must be made in English.

Senator STERLING. But anybody can attend the meetings?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Anybody can attend the meetings.

Mr. RUBIN. Is there anything you want to say about raiding by the soldiers?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There has been; it is the report that lots of houses have been raided.

The CHAIRMAN. Lots of houses raided?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. That is the report?

Mr. RATTENBURY. That is the report. I was not there; only at this incident at Paul Glaser's I was out and seen what was done the next day afterwards. It was a brutal thing.

The CHAIRMAN. That was done by these special deputies?

Mr. RATTENBURY. By the regular police and, I believe, by the deputy sheriffs.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe that special case of Glaser was testified to here yesterday?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any other cases?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The ones that was mentioned yesterday. In the case of Sennet, he was raided, but there was not any damage done; they got him out of his bed in the middle of the night.

Senator PHIPPS. You speak of this trouble caused by the deputies. Was that on account of their coming into contact with pickets?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes; I believe it was.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the law in Indiana? Is not picketing prohibited?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The mayor has prohibited picketing, with certain restrictions.

Senator PHIPPS. But the pickets are allowed to speak to the men and explain to them that there is a strike on, and all that?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. But they are not permitted to prevent them from going into the mill inclosure if they insist on going?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. There have been some cases where the pickets overstepped the bounds and did prevent the men from going to work, have there not been?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not know of any. I picketed myself several days and I did not see anything that could be complained of.

Senator STERLING. Have you heard of any cases where a picket overstepped his bounds? You say you do not know any personally. Have you heard of any?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I have not.

Senator PHIPPS. What has been the cause of the trouble where you say these deputies were objectionable? Has that been the matter of raiding you have referred to?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Is there anything else you think has been improper in the conduct of the deputies?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I don't think so; except that, of course, those deputies are opposed to us, they do not lose any opportunity to show their antipathy to us.

Senator PHIPPS. Their duty is to preserve the law?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. You think they have overstepped the bounds in this case?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I think they have.

Senator PHIPPS. To what extent? Has it been where there has been a group of men congregated on the street at some public place and the deputies have gone up to them and ordered them to disperse?

Mr. RATTENBURY. The places I have heard is that they come along where the pickets are working, and there is a rule that two pickets should go together, and two is allowed to approach the worker that is going into the mill; but supposing two pickets were going along this way and two more coming in the opposite direction and they should stop for a moment to speak, then there are four, and right away they are pinched.

Senator PHIPPS. That is where the pickets overstepped the regulations under which the mayor has allowed picketing?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Then, the deputies interfered?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Then the deputies interfered. But, as far as I could learn, there was really no occasion for it. It would have been sufficient to have warned them.

Senator PHIPPS. It has not led to rioting or serious injury to any of the men, has it?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No.

Senator STERLING. Has it led to anything more than a warning by the deputies that they should not congregate in groups of over two, that that was in violation of the rules?

Mr. RATTENBURY. They have arrested them and taken them up to the city hall; put them in jail and kept them there. Our attorneys usually got them out. Sometimes they had to stay in over night, but, of course, they are aiming at what they call the reds, particularly, see? Lots of those poor fellows, that they have arrested and put in jail and kept them there without even a chance to see an attorney or to telephone home, are not reds.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, where the deputies would approach a crowd of four pickets, and perhaps one or two more men that they are talking to, they did not immediately resort to clubbing, did they, to break up the party?

Mr. RATTENBURY. No; I don't know that there has been any clubbing, except on the date when the small riot occurred.

Senator PHIPPS. You mean now the one following the street car incident, do you?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I mean the street car incident.

Senator PHIPPS. There was clubbing resorted to in order to disperse the crowd?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes. We believe it was unnecessary, a whole lot of it.

Senator STERLING. You spoke about being permitted to hold meetings in halls, etc. Now, by the way, have not meetings been held out of doors on the streets since the soldiers came?

Mr. RATTENBURY. There has been a permit for one outdoor meeting.

Senator PHIPPS. We hear some stories about these pickets being grabbed up and rushed to a stockade and put inside this military stockade, and I inquired where, and all that. As a matter of fact, are there any men congregated there in that stockade?

Mr. RATTENBURY. I do not know. The lieutenant yesterday said there were not, but the papers there said they had 50 or 60 in there—the Gary papers.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, we know how reliable some of these newspaper stories, this newspaper information, is. Even you complain of it being inaccurate?

Mr. RATTENBURY. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not think we can pay much attention to newspaper statements, unfortunately.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further, gentlemen? If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Witness.

#### **STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM S. HADDOCK, SHERIFF OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA.**

Mr. HADDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a short statement that I should like to read, and then would be glad to answer any questions you may wish to ask. Shall I go ahead?

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. HADDOCK. When the corporations and manufacturers of Allegheny County began serving notices upon the sheriff that they feared riots and mob violence would result from the steel strike to begin on September 22, my first concern was to make certain that no strike breakers, outside officers, or armed men were brought in the county to give that protection which the peace officers, starting with the policemen on their beats and running up to the high sheriff, were bound to give. Conferences were held with the representatives of the employers, all of whom felt certain that the great body of their workmen would not be affected by the strike, and that the majority of those who would strike were either aliens or persons of foreign birth, speaking other tongues than the English language. To prepare for the trouble they anticipated, demand was made for the appointment of deputy sheriffs. I stated that inasmuch as it had been the custom under situations of this kind, after receiving the notice provided by law, demanding protection, that deputy sheriffs could be appointed under certain conditions.

The first condition was that they must all be citizens of the United States and of the county and if possible of the immediate neighborhood where they were to act as such officers; that they must be men of known dependability, sober and of steady habits, and that when possible they should be men acquainted with the people and property they were to protect, and wherever possible should come from the ranks of the forces of workmen in that particular manufactory; that each one must give a bond of at least \$2,000 to faithfully discharge the duties imposed upon him by law and his oath of office.



Furthermore, to protect the taxpayers of the county, because such an emergency had not arisen which I felt justified the exercise of the full powers of the sheriff under the law at the general expense of the people, each corporation or manufacturer, in fear of such disorder, must contract to pay and save the sheriff of Allegheny County from all expenses of every kind and character incident to the employment of such officers of the law. On this basis we have worked, and in Allegheny County approximately 5,000 deputy sheriffs are now commissioned in service and on duty.

After this much of the plan was decided upon, I made a personal tour of the county to ascertain all the local conditions, and to make certain just how far the representations to me were true or not true. The result of that trip was the publishing and posting on Saturday night, September 20, and Sunday, September 21, of a proclamation, a copy of which is attached, commanding and requiring all local peace officers to be on their guard and perform their official duties and to give notice to them that in populous districts where disturbances were likely to occur, groups of three or more persons must be disbursed until this emergency is over. I was careful to state in this proclamation that the rights and liberties of the people were not to be infringed upon or interfered with.

In addition to this, I verbally announced that the sheriff would not overrule the local authorities as to public meetings, except that whenever possible to prevent no public meeting were to be permitted or conducted in any foreign tongue. My reason for this order is that this is America, where the English language is the official and common tongue, and that my observation has been in this and other troubles that practically 90 per cent of the offenders against the law in matters of this kind are either aliens or naturalized citizens of foreign extraction, who are easily led into attacks upon our Government. I have not said that I will absolutely prohibit any meeting or gathering of foreigners or persons speaking some other tongue than the English language, but for the present at least, until normal conditions are restored, I have determined that no such meeting of foreigners shall be held with my sanction, except that I have positive assurance that no seditious addresses or criticisms of our Government or our system of government shall take place.

There are in Allegheny County over 40 members of the Pennsylvania State constabulary cooperating with me.

One of the greatest causes of trouble or social unrest such as now exists by reason of this steel strike, is the circulation of wild, anarchistic, and unfounded rumors and stories concerning the conduct of the State constabulary, the deputy sheriffs, and what happens to those lawless persons who offend and are arrested. The greatest evil in the county, which I have observed, is that of the agitator upon the workingman whom he exploits. The reports to me, and my investigations, show that the agitators in what trouble there is here are strangers to this community; that they came here without solicitation, and have a system of working and operating among the foreign laboring element, involving the masses against the classes.

Up to this date, October 24, 1919, good order has been maintained, with but one or two very small and unimportant outbreaks due possibly to relaxation of vigilance on the part of local officers be-

cause normal conditions seemed to actually be restored. Allegheny County has had no real violence.

We attribute this entirely to the earnest cooperation of all peace officers from the policemen to the mayors.

Yet there is a condition of unrest and uncertainty because of the efforts to enlist men actually at work in the cause of the strikers. The agitators are very active and stage every incident they can, such as law suits, meetings when permitted, etc., to attract the wakingman's attention, but in all the plants of Allegheny County it is doubtful if more than 5,000 men are actually on strike. Most all of these are foreign and unskilled labor.

We have had all the customary troubles of an ugly strike, such as writing of threatening letters, intimidation of people going to and from work, and strikers attacking and beating up workmen, but whenever and wherever possible, the offenders are being arrested and punished.

The strikers make great complaint that they are denied their constitutional rights of free speech and assemblage. But this has not been denied them except in strike zones by local officers, or by the sheriff for extraordinary reasons.

On October 22, 1919, the strikers sued for an injunction to restrain the authorities from denying them the privilege of holding meetings in one of the strike zones of Pittsburgh, but upon a full and extended hearing the court refused to interfere.

Supplementing my letter to you in regard to the Fannie Sellins case there are a number of reputable witnesses who were present and can testify from personal observation that her body, and particularly her back, contained no evidence of any injury other than the gunshot wounds about the head and face as were developed by the coroner's inquest. This evidence and the testimony taken by the coroner, in accordance with your request, will be forwarded to your honorable committee immediately.

The steel workers' committee have been using the unfortunate death of Mrs. Sellins as propaganda, whereas she met death on August 26 in a coal miners' strike begun on July 26, 1919. There is not the remotest connection between the two strikes, yet the wildest and most false statements are published broadcast with resolutions of condemnation that she met her death in the steel strike.

I submit herewith newspapers and some resolutions to show how deliberately and widespread is the effort to make the Snellins's death propaganda for the steel strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You say there is something more you wish to put in, Mr. Haddock?

Mr. HADDOCK. Here are some resolutions that were adopted in the Snellins case, and here is the proclamation.

(The resolutions referred to are here printed in full as follows:)

PITTSBURGH, PA., *September 23, 1919.*

Your committee appointed in regular session to draft resolutions dealing with the death of members of the United Mine Workers of Brackenridge, Pa., submit for your approval and sanction the following sections:

Whereas on the 26th day of August, at the mines of the Allegheny Steel Co., in Brackenridge, Pa., deputies under the instructions of Chief Deputy Dennison, in conjunction with mine guards, have controlled an act of crime of the most conspicuous character against members of the United Mine Workers of America,

a bona fide labor organization, striking at the present time for better conditions and wages; and

Whereas the crime was directed against a law-abiding citizen, peacefully walking on a public highway in the vicinity of the mines, but by no means on the property of the aforesaid company. This man being old and inoffensive, was brutally clubbed and through numerous bullets fired from a high-penetrating gun was finally killed as his prostrated body was lying on the ground. Any notion of escape or offense was out of the question; and

Whereas only a short time later Mrs. Fannie Snellins, a woman organizer for the United Mine Workers, and a welfare worker among the women and children of the striking miners, a respectful lady and devoted advocate of labor, who witnessing the murder of the aforesaid male person, secured shelter for innocent children in danger of being shot, approaching the scene of the foul deed she pleaded for mercy for the victim of the deputies and was threatened, insulted, and murdered by a mine guard named Murray, alias Browksi; and

Whereas the threats against the miners were made by Chief Deputy Dennison previous to the occurrence of these cases, also many other unlawful happenings were observed; and

Whereas the persons connected with these crimes having been arrested were either returned to duty at the place of the occurrence of the crime or released on cheap bail, contrary to our laws covering the State and county, we, the members of Local 1029, International Association of Machinists, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, emphatically protest against the brutal manner in which the notorious murder was executed and demand punishment for the perpetrators of the crime to the full provision of the law, and removal from office of all officials guilty in connection with violation of the articles covering its execution.

D. A. DUNMIRE,  
CHRIS CHAMBERS,  
JOHN PAULUS,  
*Resolution Committee.*

---

PITTSBURGH CENTRAL LABOR UNION.

**RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE CENTRAL LABOR UNION OF PITTSBURGH,  
REPRESENTING 180,000 AFFILIATED MEMBERS.**

The members of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union do hereby request that a Federal investigation be made for the purpose of fixing the responsibility for the most atrocious and cruel double murder every committed in Allegheny County.

Whereas there has been a strike by the employees of the Allegheny Coal & Coke Co. against conditions established by said company; and

Whereas said employees requested the mine workers of this district to organize them; and after an investigation by representatives of the organization of the United Mine Workers of America, and finding out that the miners of this mine were determined to secure the establishment of the Mine Workers' organization for the purpose of protecting their economic interests and shortening their work day from 10 to 8 hours.

The officials of the United Mine Workers of America in order to work out a harmonious agreement requested the officials of said Allegheny Coal Co. to meet with them to work out an amicable agreement as representatives of their employees. This request was not met with by the officials of the Allegheny Coal & Coke Co., hence the strike; and

Whereas there had been no trouble between the striking miners and company officials, but on the morning of August 26, the organizers of the United Mine Workers of America had been notified by the sheriff's chief deputy that they had better look out to-day, as they, the deputies, were going to make it rough for the miners. The same day a number of deputies arrived on the scene, and each one was equipped with a riot gun, although there had been no trouble, nor was there any anticipated by the striking miners; and from reliable evidence since sworn to, the only trouble that has ever been there was created by the deputies, who are presumably placed there at the expense of the taxpayers of Allegheny County to keep down the things which they alone are responsible for; and

Whereas there has been two brutal murders committed at West Natrona; and Whereas all the evidence adduced to date shows plainly that said murders were committed by deputies in the employ of the sheriff's office; and Whereas these murders have all the signs of being planned beforehand, and, as a result, being premeditated;

Whereas there have been two deputies arrested charged with murder and committed to jail without bail by Justice of the Peace Thomas Conway, of Tarentum; and in spite of this fact one of these deputies named Mannison was back at West Natrona on the job as deputy the next day after being committed to jail on an unballable offense, and the other one named Murray, alias Maroski, is at liberty as well; and

Whereas the representatives of organized labor have and are now doing everything in their power to prevent the spread of anarchy and Bolshevism in this country; and we condemn it and are opposed to it when practiced by the sheriff's representatives as much as we do when it is preached or practiced anywhere else: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the delegates to the Central Labor Union,* That we protest against the outrageous and unlawful murders committed by the deputy sheriffs at West Natrona and demand that responsibility be fixed for the same; and that we demand that the deputy sheriffs charged with this heinous crime be treated by the courts, the coroner, and the sheriff as any other criminal charged with a similar offense would be under the law; and

*Be it further resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to all affiliated local unions, a copy to the President of the United States, to the Department of Labor, to all Congressmen and Senators from Pennsylvania, to the mayor and officials of the city of Pittsburgh, and request that all locals receiving this take similar action.

(Signed)

W. K. HECK, *President.*

CENTRAL LABOR UNION.

F. P. HANAWAY, *Secretary.*

CENTRAL LABOR UNION.

(The proclamation referred to is here printed in full as follows:)

PROCLAMATION BY THE SHERIFF OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Whereas, I, William S. Haddock, sheriff of Allegheny County, have been formally notified by many citizens, industrial corporations, and employers that printed inflammatory circulars and other information have been distributed and disseminated among the people calling a general strike of all employees of various industrial manufactories throughout Allegheny County with the request that they cease work and leave their places of employment and by reason thereof there now exists among the people great unrest, uncertainty, and doubt as to the safety of life, liberty, and prosperity, therefore,

I, William S. Haddock, sheriff of Allegheny County, by virtue of the authority vested in me, and the duties imposed upon me, by law, do hereby notify all mayors, burgesses, justices of the peace, constables, and policemen, whomever they are and wheresoever they may be in Allegheny County, that the primary duty of maintaining public order, preserving the public peace, preserving the rights of all citizens and protecting all public and private property from loss, injury, or destruction rests upon you and each of you, and that if any persons shall unlawfully, riotously, and tumultuously assemble together so as to endanger the public peace that you must immediately go among said rioters and then and there make proclamation in the name of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requiring and commanding all such persons so assembled immediately to disperse themselves and peaceably depart to their habitations, or to their lawful business, and if such persons, notwithstanding such proclamation continue together you are required to immediately cause their arrest and prosecution in the manner prescribed by law.

All peace officers throughout Allegheny County until the present emergency has passed are commanded to disperse and prevent upon the highways or vacant property of all populous sections the loitering or gathering of three or more persons, and whenever such gatherings occur to immediately direct and command such persons to proceed about their lawful business, avocation, or return to their homes and habitations.

Until such emergencies as this shall arise or some unlawful act has been committed, no orderly or peaceable person shall be disturbed or any of his lawful rights infringed upon.

Notice is also given that the law provides that all persons suffering any injury, loss of property, or damages in any manner by reason of the acts of mobs or riotous persons can recover the full value therefor from the County of Allegheny and that such damages must be paid by the taxpayers and every person responsible therefor.

**RIOT ACT AND PENALTY FOR DESTROYING THIS PROCLAMATION AND REFUSING TO AID THE SHERIFF.**

"If any person shall knowingly, willfully, and forcibly obstruct, resist, or oppose any sheriff, coroner, or other officer of the Commonwealth or other person duly authorized in serving or attempting to serve or execute any legal process whatsoever, or shall assault or beat any sheriff, coroner, constable, or other officer or person duly authorized in serving or executing any process or order as aforesaid, or for and because of having served or executed the same, or if any person shall rescue another in legal custody, or if any person being required by any sheriff, coroner, constable, or other officer of the Commonwealth shall neglect or refuse to assist him in the execution of his office in any criminal case or in the preservation of the peace, or in apprehending and securing any person for a breach of the peace, such person shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction be sentenced to imprisonment not exceeding one year and to pay a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars, or either or both, in the discretion of the court. (Sec. 8, act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, approved Mar. 31, 1860, P. L. 386.)

"If any persons riotously and tumultuously assembled together to the disturbance of the public peace shall unlawfully and with force demolish or pull down or destroy, or begin to demolish, pull down, or destroy, any public building, private dwelling, church, meetinghouse, stable, barn, mill, granary, malt house, or outhouse, or any building or erection used in carrying on any trade or manufacture, or any branch thereof, or any machinery, whether fixed or movable, prepared for or employed in any manufacture or any branch thereof, or any steam engine or other engine for sinking, working, or draining any mine, or any building or erection used in conducting the business of any mine, or any bridge, wagon way, road or trunk for conveying minerals from any mine; every such offender shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, being convicted thereof, shall be imprisoned by separate or solitary confinement at labor or by simple imprisonment not exceeding seven years. (Sec. 20, act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, approved Mar. 31, 1860, P. L. 389.)

"If any person shall be concerned in any riot, rout, unlawful assembly, or an affray and shall be thereof convicted, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or undergo an imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both or either, at the discretion of the court, and in case anyone is convicted of an aggravated riot the court may sentence the offender to imprisonment by separate or solitary confinement at labor not exceeding three years. (Sec. 19, act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, approved Mar. 31, 1860, P. L. 389.)"

Notice is also given that to guard against any and all disturbance of the public peace or interference with the rights of any and all citizens and to protect all property provision has been made to uphold the law under any and all emergencies which can possibly arise by reason of the acts of any mobs, tumultuous, or riotous persons, and that all persons found inciting or encouraging disturbances of the peace or interfering with the rights of any person by any act of commission or omission will be immediately and summarily dealt with in the manner provided by law.

All persons are therefore warned and directed to proceed about their daily avocations with the assurance that life, liberty, and property is fully protected.

In witness whereof I, William S. Haddock, sheriff of Allegheny County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, have hereunto set my hand this 20th day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen and the year of this Commonwealth the one hundred and forty-fourth.

WILLIAM S. HADDOCK,  
Sheriff of Allegheny County.

The CHAIRMAN. In your judgment, not over 5,000 men are on strike now in Allegheny County?

Mr. HADDOCK. That is what I think at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. You have, you say, about 5,000 deputies?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Sworn in as deputies—men sworn in?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they employees of the steel company, all of them?

Mr. HADDOCK. The majority.

The CHAIRMAN. A majority of them are?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Not all of them?

Mr. HADDOCK. Not all of them; no, sir.

Senator STERLING. Just in this connection Senator, if you will permit, he says, "I think not over 5,000 men on strike now." I should like to ask the sheriff if he knows how many workers there are in Allegheny County in the steel industry—your best judgment—if you do not know accurately?

Mr. HADDOCK. I do not know accurately, but I would say between 50,000 and 75,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any deputies who are not residents of the county?

Mr. HADDOCK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all residents?

Mr. HADDOCK. They are all residents.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether any of them are what are termed "strike breakers"?

Mr. HADDOCK. No strike breakers at all. I know that for an absolute fact, because there were strike-breaking concerns came into Pittsburgh before and stayed there a week or so after the start of the strike and I know that they could not get any men put out at all.

Senator STERLING. You say strike-breaking concerns. Just what do you mean by that?

Mr. HADDOCK. There are firms in this country, you know, that put on a strike and will furnish you with 200 or 300 or 1,000 men to come in and break up the strike.

Senator STERLING. Regular organizations for that purpose?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir. Here are some of these newspapers.

Senator STERLING. Mr. Sheriff, did you hear the testimony taken by the committee at Pittsburgh?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I did not hear it. I read it later; yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you read the testimony of certain attorneys there as to the method of procedure in police court when strikers were brought in under arrest?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; I read, I think, both instances of the testimony of two attorneys.

Senator STERLING. Can you speak, from personal knowledge, to the committee about the method of procedure?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, in reference to the cases mentioned by those two attorneys I have no personal knowledge, you know. I am not really in touch with all the little details, because the mayor and the police department they run things entirely themselves, and I would

not be called in on them. In a general sense I have charge of this whole county, which takes in Pittsburgh, and I am responsible for the peace and order of the county, but I only go into a community when the local authorities can not handle the situation themselves. I have heard different stories, but I have also heard the police side of it, and they have said entirely opposite to what the attorneys testified. For instance, one attorney came over there; he did not know even who he was to represent, and you take the ordinary police court and you go in there and you are supposed to know who you are going to defend, and in a condition like this I guess they did not go out of their way to fix them up. That is about the way I figured it.

Senator PHIPPS. In this entire territory, Allegheny County, we will say, over which you have general jurisdiction, is it not so divided up into municipalities that the police power is always exercised by the magistrates coming under the municipal government?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Are there any places outside of the towns where there are police courts that you have jurisdiction over?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; none whatsoever.

Senator PHIPPS. You spoke about the State constabulary cooperating with you in looking after the situation, keeping law and order. How many members of that constabulary have been kept in Allegheny County since September 22?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, they were there before September 22, Senator.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; that is the date of the strike. How many before then and how many since?

Mr. HADDOCK. There was 32 before September 22, and now I think there are 42.

Senator PHIPPS. Forty-two?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Less than 50 all told?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Have there been more than that at any time?

Mr. HADDOCK. Never.

Senator PHIPPS. How have they been allotted—according to request or the size of the population in the particular municipality?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; the important district. I can not say that the figures are absolutely correct, but they are divided something like this: Clairton, we have 6 troopers there. At Dravosburg, which is right across the river from Glassport and McKeesport, we have headquarters for 10 to take care of McKeesport and Glassport, and they are so situated that they could reach Duquesne very readily. In Rankin I have 5, in Homestead 12, and I think 6 in Brady and 5 at Aetna.

Senator PHIPPS. They are on duty day and night?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; they work in shifts, you know. I think their term of service is eight hours.

Senator PHIPPS. Eight hours?

Mr. HADDOCK. Each man, three shifts.

Senator PHIPPS. Divided up into three shifts?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Then, according to that, there would not be over 14 effectives at any time in the entire county. Is that correct?

Mr. HADDOCK. That is correct.

Senator PHIPPS. We have been told that there was complaint of not only the action of the members of the State constabulary, but the manner in which they are armed. What is their equipment? What weapons do they carry?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, they carry a regulation revolver and stick.

Senator PHIPPS. Like a policeman's club?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; on ordinary duty.

Senator PHIPPS. Do they carry a carbine or riot gun?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; they do not carry a carbine. Ordinarily they have a carbine, but they don't usually carry it except on extreme occasions. On ordinary patrol duty they do not carry it.

Senator STERLING. There was some evidence, Mr. Sheriff, of the conduct of the constabulary at McKeesport and the maltreatment of a hotel keeper there—Mr. Dressel, I think. Was that matter called to your attention?

Mr. HADDOCK. That was not. That was at Homestead, I think, that one. I felt this way about that: The strikers' committee, headed by Mr. Tighe, the president of the Amalgamated Association, visited me at my office. I think there was about 12 or 14 of them. The most of them were all local men that are on this steel committee, and they complained of the conduct of the State constabulary and also of the deputy sheriffs. I told them at that time that if they could bring a specific case to me for my deputy sheriffs that I would see that that man was punished. Regarding the State constabulary I told them the same thing, that I would be glad to take it up at once with the commander of that particular troop, but I have never received any specific complaint from the strikers' committee regarding any particular individual.

Senator STERLING. What do you know about the employment of colored men as deputies in some of these places—Clairton, for example?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, the reason for that at Clairton, Senator, was that it was the request of the steel company, and these men were employees of the steel company.

Senator STERLING. Did you hear complaint of some abuses by these colored men there?

Mr. HADDOCK. No, sir; no complaint whatsoever.

Senator PHIPPS. How are they armed?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, it depends entirely, Senator, upon the companies themselves, how far they want to go with the men in arming them. I do not furnish them any arms at all. These deputies have the full power of a deputy sheriff and can carry arms.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe you said something over 50,000 steel workers probably were affected by this strike?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; they asked me how many. Between 50,000 and 75,000 was my estimate of the number of steel workers in Allegheny County.

Senator PHIPPS. You would think not exceeding 5,000 of those men are on strike at the present time?

Mr. HADDOCK. From the reports that I received.

Senator PHIPPS. How many do you think went out on strike on September 22 or following days?



Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I would say possibly between 10,000 and 15,000 in Allegheny County.

Senator STERLING. How did you learn something about the situation over at Monet?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; I have enough trouble; I have not kept in touch much with that.

Senator STERLING. That is in another county?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; that is another county.

Senator PHIPPS. Clarton is in Allegheny County, is it not?

Mr. HADDOCK. ————.

Senator PHIPPS. Then the line comes in just above?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further, gentlemen? If not, we are much obliged, Mr. Sheriff, unless you have something more to say yourself.

Mr. HADDOCK. I just handed you those papers to show you how they played that Fannie Snellins case up.

### STATEMENT OF MR. DAVID WILLIAMS.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Organizer for the International Association of Machinists.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is your home?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Allentown, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you work in the mills, or have you worked in the mills?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not since 1910.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been an organizer since that time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I have worked at other places; but I have been an organizer for about four years.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you some prepared statement you want to submit?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; our case is a little bit different from the others, and I should like to read this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You speak of your case. Is that a particular location—Bethlehem Steel?

### STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE OF STRIKING STEEL WORKERS OF THE BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 25, 1919.

*To the honorable members of the committee of the United States Senate investigating the causes of the steel strike:*

GENTLEMEN: In requesting a hearing before your committee in the interests of the employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co. it is with the desire to give your committee the information as to the reasons and causes which forced the employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co. to request the national committee of the American Federation of Labor for organizing the iron and steel workers to call a strike in the Bethlehem Steel plants on September 29, 1919.

Briefly stated, the dissatisfaction and unrest among the employees has existed in the Bethlehem plant for almost two years past. Due to an unfair bonus system used, contract and piecework systems, low hourly rates of pay, and the differential in the number of hours that constituted the working schedule in the various shops, a strike of machine-shop employees took place at Bethlehem on April 30, 1918.

After being on strike for almost two weeks, and upon the failure of the conciliators from the Pennsylvania State department of labor and industry and conciliators for the United States Department of Labor to bring about an adjustment, the case was referred to the National War Labor Board.

The first hearing on this case took place in Washington on May 20, 1918, before a section of the War Labor Board. At this hearing employees testified as to the manner in which the company used the bonus system, also the piecework system. The men laid great stress on the fact that they should be granted guaranteed hourly rates of pay, as paid by the Government to employees in the navy yards and arsenals, with overtime provisions after eight hours.

Evidence was presented to show how production was interfered with, and claims were made that under the systems of paying the employees it was impossible for an employee to calculate the amount of his earnings, etc. The entire testimony taken at this hearing, as well as those which will be noted later, is on file in the office of the Department of Labor in the proceedings of the National War Labor Board.

The War Labor Board was unable to reach an agreement upon the testimony taken at this hearing, and another hearing was ordered and was held in Bethlehem on June 18-19, 1918. This hearing was held under the supervision of W. Jett Laucks, secretary of the War Labor Board.

The employees presented facts to prove that the Bethlehem Steel Co. were using every method possible to keep the employees in control and defeat the efforts being made to secure higher rates of pay or the elimination of the abuses charged against the company.

A list of 91 names of employees blacklisted by the company was presented as evidence, together with a number of sworn statements, while other witnesses appeared in person. The employees charged that the city officials refused to allow halls to be rented to labor organizations in which to hold meetings, and this charge was verified when the chief of police of Bethlehem was called to the stand and admitted that he had stopped the meetings. The halls were later opened through the assistance of the Department of Justice.

After considering the testimony heard at Bethlehem, the National War Labor Board rendered a decision on July 31, 1918, known as docket No. 22, in which the board, among other points acted upon, made these decisions:

"The bonus system now in operation should be entirely revised or eliminated; piecework rates should be revised also; and a designated, guaranteed minimum hourly wage rate should be established in conformity with such of the scales now being applied by the War or Navy Department as most nearly fits the conditions in this particular case.

"Instead of going along with the War Labor Board and working for the best interests of the Government at a time when cooperation was so essential to the success of the war, the company continued to discriminate against the employees, and another appeal was made to the War Labor Board at a hearing held in Washington September 11, 1918, at which time the members of the national committee for organizing the iron and steel workers accompanied the committee from Bethlehem to the meeting of the War Labor Board.

"At this hearing the employees presented evidence to show that munitions for the United States Government were held up while contracts for foreign governments were being pushed to the limit, simply because foremen and officials of the plant received a bonus on the foreign orders. The joint committee of officials of the American Federation of Labor, national committee for organizing the iron and steel workers, and committee of employees at this time urged the War Labor Board to recommend to the Government to take over the plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co. at Bethlehem and put into effect the award handed down by the War Labor Board, the company up to this time refusing to go along with the award.

"The national committee for organizing the iron and steel workers had in the meantime assigned several organizers to assist the employees to organize, so that while the original complaint before the War Labor Board had been limited to machinists and electricians, the other trades were taking advantage of that part of the award which applied to the other employees and presented requests upon the company for standard rates of pay.

"Although Acting Secretary of War Benedict Crowell wrote Mr. E. G. Grace, president of the Bethlehem Steel Co. under date of September 21, 1918, guaranteeing to pay the company any additional sums made necessary by putting into effect the award of the War Labor Board, the company still refused to pay this money to the employees.

"On November 19, 1918, the administrators of the War Labor Board at Bethlehem made a ruling in which was specified the rates of pay for machine shop employees to be paid under the award, based upon the rates paid in Government plants on August 1, 1918. These rates made the minimum rates for machinists 72 cents per hour, and for toolmakers 75 cents per hour. Lower rates were made for specialists, helpers, apprentices, and laborers, according to the amount of experience and qualifications laid down by the administrators. At the time the ruling was made, however, the rates in the Government plants had been increased to 80 cents per hour for machinists and 86 for toolmakers, yet the company refused to go along with the lower set of rates made by the administrators.

"Finally another hearing was called by the War Labor Board on this case in Washington on January 13, 1919. At this time the administrators in charge at Bethlehem presented to the War Labor Board a report on their work at Bethlehem. They reported that they had elected some 64 shop committees for all departments at Bethlehem, but that the company refused to negotiate with these committees on collective bargaining. They also reported that due to laying off of the committeemen by the company that some committees ceased to exist.

"Reporting on the workers in other departments outside machine shops and electrical workers the administrators had this to say:

"Requests for adjustments of wages and conditions have been prepared by over a dozen committees and presented to the management from rank to rank, as indicated by a bulletin issued by the examiner after conference with the authorized company representative, Mr. Larkin, but the company has declined to discuss these requests with any of the committees, nor has it granted any of them."

On the matter of continued discrimination against the employees after the award had been rendered, the examiners made this report:

"There have been many charges by the employees of discrimination by the management against the workers on the ground of union membership, union activity, committee activity, against Americans in favor of alien enemies and other noncitizens, against residents of other towns in favor of Bethlehem residents, on the ground of personal grudge, etc. Certain cases he has reported to the board and to the company. There is considerable prima facie evidence of concerted and intentional discrimination in certain departments of the plant."

The administrator ended his report to the board with the following statements:

"\* \* \* He has held no formal hearings on differences arising between the parties, for the reason that the company refused to deal with the committees, refused to give any information, refused to carry out rulings or to adopt suggestions from the administrator, and requested the board to withdraw him. \* \* \*

"As will be seen by the foregoing, the award in this case has remained for the most part inoperative, due principally to the delays caused by the company and its final repudiation of the award. \* \* \*

"\* \* \* It is safe to say that no award or findings by the board has encountered such obstacles and has remained ineffective so long as Docket No. 22."

At the session held on January 15, 1919, Chairman William H. Taft, of the War Labor Board, after listening to the excuses offered by Attorney Guy Currier, representing the company, addressed the representatives of the company in this manner:

"The situation is very painful to me, for the reason that what we wish to do is to secure what, under our award, these workers are entitled to have, and it is very difficult for me to escape the conclusion that the conduct of the company in this matter, the correspondence that has been adduced, the dealing with Mr. Grace, the action by the board in attempting to help Mr. Grace, and the present attitude; and the company, after there had been a change in conditions, in refusing to go on when the company had given the board every reason to believe they would go on with, colors the situation with a sense of injustice that makes one yearn the judicial powers to compel justice; but we have not the judicial power \* \* \*."

Hearings on the case were still continued in Washington on January 18, 1919, and in New York on February 4, 1919, when Attorney Paul D. Cravath, representing the company, presented a statement to the board that the company would agree to take up with the employees the inauguration of a plan of

collective bargaining and also secure an adjustment of the retroactive pay due under the award.

Following this hearing at New York, efforts were made by the employees to get the company to agree upon a plan of collective bargaining. On February 17, 1918, the employees submitted a plan which contained this paragraph under the heading of grievances:

"In case no adjustment is reached between the management and the executive committee within a period of five days, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of the United States Department of Labor at Washington for a decision, and his decision shall be final and binding."

The employees realized that they were agreeing to compulsory arbitration under this clause, but in their efforts to show their desire for harmonious working conditions, this was suggested to the company.

A few days later the company answered the employees and made counter propositions to almost every suggestion made by the employees and refused the suggestion for arbitration of grievances in this statement:

"Concerning the provision for the reference of unsettled cases to the United States Department of Labor, the company desires to again state that matters arising for adjustment are to be settled between the management and its employees. The required reference of cases to any outside agency would provide for compulsory arbitration, a feature which we believe undesirable in a cooperative collective bargaining plan."

Being unable to agree upon a plan of collective bargaining, the War Labor Board finally, on April 3, 1919, submitted a plan which was finally signed by both employees and company on May 1, 1919.

The employees signed this plan of collective bargaining with the intention of doing everything in their power to abide by the provisions therein, but found out that the employees were powerless to adjust their grievances or wage rates, and at the same time were powerless to stop reductions of wages, discriminations, or any other grievances which the officials continued to inflict upon them.

Following out the provision of the plan of collective bargaining, the employees made request for standard rates of pay throughout the plant and for the eight-hour day, and on August 20, 1919, Mr. Quincy Bent, vice president of the company, refused to grant these requests of the men. In his conference with the committee of employees, Mr. Bent told the men he could not grant them these concessions unless other steel mills granted them to their employees, and that if they were installed in Bethlehem the company would have to install them in its other plants.

This refusal was followed by the men sending for Secretary William Z. Foster of the national committee, to come to Bethlehem for a meeting August 24, and the general committee of employees requested Foster to have the national committee include the Bethlehem plants in its movement for the eight-hour day and standard rates of pay.

A conference was called a week later of delegates from four plants of the Bethlehem Co. located at Sparrows Point, Md.; Steeltown, Pa.; Reading, Pa.; and Bethlehem, Pa. This conference was attended by 52 delegates, representing 12 international unions and the Federal unions of the American Federation of Labor. The following resolution was adopted by the conference:

"Whereas in the steel mills of the Bethlehem Steel Co. at Bethlehem, Steelton, Lebanon, Reading, and Sparrows Point there exist systems of collective bargaining that deny the rights and privileges of the employees to secure just working conditions and make almost useless and impossible any attempt to secure for the employees the same wage rates and working conditions secured from the Bethlehem Steel Co. by the employees of the shipyards of the same company, who enjoy a federated agreement secured through the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the representatives from these points in conference assembled at Allentown, Pa., August 31, 1919,* That we request the national committee for organizing the iron and steel workers that in the settlement of the controversy now existing definite steps be taken with the management of the Bethlehem Steel Co. to discontinue the company plan for collective bargaining and allow our members to adjust grievances and settle wage disputes through the organizations and labor unions of our choice, and that we recommend that an agreement be secured through the American Federation of Labor."

Three weeks later another conference of the same delegates was held in Allentown, when the national committee was requested to secure a conference

with the officials of the Bethlehem Steel Co. by Thursday, September 25, or call a strike of the employees of the various plants. Failing to secure the conference, the strike was ordered on Saturday, September 27, to take effect on Monday, September 29.

When the men went on strike they were met with the combined force of company and city administration being lined up against them. The mayor of Bethlehem is a vice president of the Bethlehem Steel Co. The chief of police is an ex-State policeman. No public meetings have been allowed since the strike took place, men are arrested for picketing, and the city is ruled absolutely by the company through the city officials. In fact, a state of industrial serfdom already exists in Bethlehem.

Denied a place to meet to discuss their grievances and with credit denied them by the business men lined up with the company, many men, due to their economic conditions, have been forced to return to work at the company terms.

The hourly rate paid most of the mechanics in the Bethlehem plant is lower than the rate paid helpers in the Government plants. No more worse system of autocracy was ever forced upon men than must be submitted to by the employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co. in Bethlehem, the company insisting upon controlling the workers' mind and body.

Throughout the war these men were as patriotic as any body of men in the United States. I have shown you how the men waited from time to time for the company to put into effect the award of the War Labor Board, and it was only after 15 months of persecution and discrimination by the company, during which time only a few electricians have received their retroactive pay and all other employees being denied it, that these men took a stand and revolted against the policy of the company.

We charge that this company, by its methods of production during the war, did not give our Government the material that should have been produced in this plant; that Government work was neglected; and that the present strike is the result of the policy of the company toward its employees and its neglect to do justice to the Government.

The company in its actions cared not for Government officials or members of the War Labor Board. Although quoted as making millions of dollars profits, the hourly rate paid mechanics at Bethlehem is in most cases less than 50 cents per hour, the employees being forced to work piecework or bonus in order to increase their rate to anything like just wages.

This policy of forcing the men to work piecework produces an inferior grade of work and one that gives the United States inspectors on ordnance work great trouble in order to get the work finished up to the proper specifications and occasions great delay in getting the work from the shops.

This resulted during the war in holding up work that was badly needed by our troops in France, and we respectfully urge that your committee grant a further hearing in the causes of the unrest and resulting strike at Bethlehem, at which time you call as witnesses Maj. Gen. C. C. Williams, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, or other Ordnance officers; Chairman William H. Taft and Frank P. Walsh, of the War Labor Board; Mr. W. Jett Laucks, Dr. E. B. Woods, Richard B. Gregg, and officials of the War Labor Board, who can testify to the arrogance of this company and the patience with which the men submitted to the unjust policy in an effort to bring about a satisfactory settlement.

We believe that this matter should be thoroughly investigated, and the mere forcing of the return of some of the strikers through dire economic necessity only creates in the minds of these men a resentment that leads toward radicalism.

Details as to the manner in which the company treated the committeemen, how employees were laid off, discharged, and discriminated against can be given you by the officers of the committee who are present.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are employed at Bethlehem?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We believe that there was between 9,000 and 10,000 at the time of the strike, but there have been statements made in papers that there were 13,500.

The CHAIRMAN. How many went out on strike?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We had probably 70 to 80 per cent go on strike the first few days.

The CHAIRMAN. You said that some had gone back. How many have gone back?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are figuring that from 40 to 50 per cent have gone back. They have combined the shifts, on account of having three shifts; they have the men they did get back all on one shift.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it from your statement that there was some complaint there as to wages?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At most places there seems to be no complaint about wages, but complaints about hours of service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have been trying for years to get the standard rates of wages in that plant as are paid by the Government in arsenals and navy yards.

Senator McKELLAR. What do they pay unskilled labor per hour at Bethlehem?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As far as I know the unskilled labor runs in the neighborhood of 35 cents an hour.

Senator McKELLAR. It is not 42 cents an hour, as it is elsewhere, at Pittsburgh, for instance?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; we have a good many working at the machinist trade that are paid less than 43 cents an hour. I know the rates of pay there, because in order to get the proper classification for this retroactive pay under the War Labor Board's award we got out a questionnaire, in which we found out the man's rate of wages, his experience, and his check number, and we found very few were paid over 55 cents an hour and most of them under 50 cents an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us something about the hours of labor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of the machine shops work 8 hours, and then another bunch of men work 10 hours and 25 minutes, and the rolling mill men work 12 hours. So any machinist in a rolling mill has 12 hours' pay on other commercial work; on other commercial work, 10 hours and 25 minutes; and some of those men doing Government work only work 8 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The complaint against the company, the general indictment against them, is that they did not carry out the decision of the War Labor Board?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; they did not carry it out. The War Department has a corps of men on the job now figuring out the pay that is due the men. The board retained one man, Mr. Angelo, to look after that.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of that statement of ex-President Taft?

Mr. WILLIAMS. January 15.

The CHAIRMAN. Did that enter into this strike in any way?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it is the resulting dissatisfaction. It was only after we tried out the plan of collective bargaining that the company put in, and Mr. Bent told the men he could not do anything unless the other mills did something, that we sent to the national organization to include the Bethlehem plant in the movement.

The CHAIRMAN. And that would not have happened if they had carried out the recommendation of the War Labor Board?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; not if they had carried that out.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know why they did not carry it out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; outside of the fact that it was to their interest to keep the men at the low wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what would that finding have been if they had carried it out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would have increased the machinists' rates of pay—well, they would compare now to what the Railroad Administration has put in the railroad shops—72 cents an hour for all mechanics.

The CHAIRMAN. Increased their pay during the war?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; what they are paying now. The navy yards during the war, to the 1st of August, were paying 72 cents an hour on an average for machinists, and in some places it ran 73 cents an hour, and the War Labor Board put in an average of 72 cents an hour, and for tool makers 75 cents an hour. But the time the ruling was made by the War Labor Board the rates had ben increased to 80 and 86 cents an hour by the Government in the navy yards.

The CHAIRMAN. And that ruling was not carried out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not yet.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it retroactive?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To August 1, last year.

The CHAIRMAN. And the railroads?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, it was not the same date as the railroads, but it was retroactive to August 1 last year, and the machinists haven't got any yet.

Senator PHIPPS. You have stated, I believe, that you have been a labor organizer for the past four years?

Mr. WILLIAMS. About four years.

Senator PHIPPS. Has that time been spent at Bethlehem?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Eastern Pennsylvania—I live in Allentown now.

Senator PHIPPS. And you have not been employed yourself as a workman in the Bethlehem plant?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not since 1910. I was employed there from 1907 to 1910, when the other strike took place.

Senator PHIPPS. Speaking about wages paid to mechanics, which you say is a rate of less than 50 cents per hour in some cases, and that very few receive as much as 55 cents per hour, did they have any bonus in addition to that prior to the time when the Labor Board stepped in to make an adjustment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Was the effect of the Labor Board's decision to abolish the bonus system and put them on the flat rate of 72 cents per hour the same as at the other plants, the Government plants you speak of?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I have copied part of the award there, where they recommended the bonus system be entirely revised or eliminated entirely, and they recommended that guaranteed hourly rates of pay be established in conformity with thoses paid in the Government plants, and they also went on in the piecework proposition and recommended that the piecework rates be revised directly under the supervision of a representative of the Ordnance Department whom they placed in there, but he was unable to get started, due to the fact that the company would not go along with the award; but the representative was there.

Senator PHIPPS. I gather from your statement that this discussion started in about April—I think April 30, 1918—and that it continued along, and that the recommendations of the War Labor Board were not put into effect even as late as January, 1919, when ex-President Taft made his statement; but following that, on or about April 4, 1919, an agreement was reached as between the Bethlehem Co. and the workmen?

Mr. WILLIAMS. May 1 they signed.

Senator PHIPPS. May 1 they signed up. Was not that agreement of May 1, 1919, put into force and effect?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was put into force and effect so far as signing was concerned, but at no time after it was signed could our men secure anything from the company through it. That is, it was into effect as far as it was supposed to be a plan of collective bargaining; they could go along, and they could talk to those officials, this official or that official, but when they presented their demands or requests for standard rates of pay they got the same answer again—that the company could not do anything for them; that is, that the company could not install the eight-hour day, could not grant these rates of pay, and that the individual members should take it up with the different superintendents, and they also told some of our committeemen, "You go back; we know you are not getting enough money, but you go and tell your superintendent what you want." In turn, they asked the committeemen to recommend to the different employees that they set aside this part of the plan of collective bargaining which had been signed, and that the wage question for the entire plan to be taken up at the same time by a subcommittee of the general committee, although the plan provides that the general committee take up the matter of wages, and they wanted after they had changed it to let each little department handle their own affairs regardless of what was going on, and with 16 machine shops in there that would mean different rates of pay in each department, and that has been the contention all the way through.

Senator PHIPPS. And your men wanted a standard rate that would apply to all departments where machinists worked?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Going back to this agreement of May 1 which was signed, for what length of time was that to continue in force?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It did not specify any length of time, but it said it could be changed at any time by agreement of both parties on 30 days' notice: that is, that 30 days' notice should be given by either party desiring to change it. That was the only length of time that was in it. The committeemen were elected until November or until their successors were selected to fill their places.

Senator STERLING. Was this an agreement fixing the rates of wages and an agreement that there should be collective bargaining?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just collective bargaining. The only reference it had to rates was that the subcommittee from the general committee—the committeemen were to be elected by the employees in the shops, and they had been, and then they selected a subcommittee that took up wage questions, and that is the only reference to wages in the agreement, that this committee should take them up.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you about the foreign element in this strike there. What percentage, in your judgment, of the strikers are



foreigners? In that question I will adopt the definition sometimes given for foreigners as men who do not speak English.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not believe there was 10 per cent. The company even admitted in a statement put out by the New York newspaper men that there was no foreign strike in Bethlehem; it was an American strike. All our men practically are citizens; we have very few foreigners; we have no foreign organizers there; no meetings where there are any foreigners, and there are no interpretations required as far as I know—that is, we do not have any speakers that interpret the resolutions or anything to go before the meeting.

Senator McKELLAR. What per cent of the workers at Bethlehem are foreigners?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should judge probably 25 or 30 per cent now. During the war there was a great deal more. During the war they had a large number of alien enemies in there that were working on war work—Germans and Austrians—but they have laid off two-thirds of the force there, practically.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the I. W. W.?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We do not have anything like it at all there.

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing at all like that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir. They could not connect any radicalism at all with this strike in Bethlehem. These men are just as good citizens as anybody. They subscribed a hundred per cent to the war loans. You can not charge anything against them. They are just as good citizens and as patriotic as any bunch of men could be. They have taken our advice, and let it go from board to board and one hearing to another. I was before the War Labor Board at least 15 times on that case. They are men that can be absolutely controlled by a conservative leader. It was only after Mr. Bent told them that they could not get anything unless the other steel mills gave it that we sent for Mr. Foster to come in and asked them to take care of that case. It was only after that. At the beginning of this strike, when they said something about the Bolshevik being behind the strike, we asked them to point out the Bolsheviks and we would have them arrested.

The CHAIRMAN. That was at Bethlehem?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUBIN. Will you produce your evidence showing your stand against the I. W. W.?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, a few years ago I was a member of the Socialist Party, but I used to fight syndicalism. Here is a circular I got out in 1913, just to show you how I stood. Here is a letter from Gov. Brumbaugh of Pennsylvania requesting me to be a member of the public safety committee in Pennsylvania in 1917.

Mr. LUBIN. Why did you quit the Socialist Party?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In 1915.

Mr. LUBIN. Tell them why.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, first of all, I had objections to all the foreign branches in it.

Senator STERLING. Are you an American-born citizen?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir. My father was a drummer boy in the Civil War and a cook in the Spanish-American War, and he is in the Soldiers' Home over here now. My mother and father was in the

Grand Army of the Republic. Both my parents were born in Pennsylvania. They had me born in Wales in this strike.

Senator PHIPPS. This agreement or understanding was made May 1, 1919, and you state that the only clause that provides for its termination is 30 days' notice from either party?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Did your people serve formal notice of 30 days on the Bethlehem people?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir; and I will tell you why. They did not give us 30 seconds' notice when they would cut a man's wages or discharge a man or discriminate against a man, and up to the time that we had sent for the national committee to take charge the plan of collective bargaining, as far as any of the provisions in it like that was concerned, was practically agreed to among the men and company that it didn't exist any more; in fact, the company had told them when we were trying to get them to put an arbitration clause in—they told them that when the time comes you fellows can strike or do anything you please. The sad part of it was that there was not some arbitration clause in there, because the men in the steel mills—this is something that you gentlemen ought to consider seriously—the Government has taken throughout the entire country and put a standard rate of pay in all the railroad shops, has put a standard rate of pay in all the navy yards and arsenals and all the shipyards; and the Bethlehem Steel Co. has an agreement with their men in the shipyards so that if a man, a machinist, who is getting 50 cents an hour at Bethlehem, quits and goes to the Bethlehem shipyard at Sparrows Point, Md., he gets 80 cents an hour, due to that agreement made to standardize wages. Right across the river from the Bethlehem Steel plant is a little railroad roundhouse, and the machinist in there is guaranteed 72 cents an hour, but he can not get it across the river in the Bethlehem plant on Government work. Now, what ought to be done is to standardize the wages in the steel mills the same as they have been standardized in the shipyards and navy yards: a board created, just as the railroad board, where a man can go and get his case taken up with the railroad board if he has any grievance. If it is not settled with the officials, an adjustment board settles that case, and in that way a man has a chance. In the steel mills they have nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. You seem to be a pretty thoughtful kind of man. Have you thought out remedies for these situations? Do you not think that some way of settling these disputes must be worked out, that strikes are really a relic of industrial barbarism, and that we have got to get away from them and have some other way of settling these matters between capital and labor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think there ought to be a board established like the War Labor Board.

The CHAIRMAN. A board that would take upon itself the functions that have been performed by the War Labor Board?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not go to compulsory arbitration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; but as between having compulsory arbitration and the unrest that is being created now, I believe—and this is just my personal opinion—that compulsory arbitration would be far better than to have it go to a strike. As I told you there, when we

recommended to the company compulsory arbitration we knew we were going against the stand of the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would prefer compulsory arbitration to strikes?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I do any time; I prefer it to the unrest that is coming now. They may say they are settling the thing by starving the men back to the plant. Just take yourself. If you were starving because you had refused to work for what you thought was not a fair rate, how would you feel about it? That is making more Bolsheviks. They are making more Bolsheviks to-day with autocracy than Foster ever did with his book, because nobody knew about his book until the papers told about it.

The CHAIRMAN. You think a temporary settlement does not amount to much, but that there must be some permanent settlement on the basis of justice and right?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think a board like the War Labor Board would be helpful?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I will tell you why. The company was represented by two of the best attorneys, and we presented our case, and the War Labor Board, with ex-President Taft and Mr. Walsh, gave us a square deal; and consequently I have a lot of respect for a good board of that make-up.

The CHAIRMAN. A board of the highest type with square-deal men on it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course if we put ex-politicians or politicians on it it might be a failure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I tell you, it is just like this conference held over here. If they want to get together they can get together, but if they want to just go down the line because they have the power to force it through, I am afraid of what is going to happen. We keep down radicalism in the labor unions, but I tell you you don't have to ask men to go out on strike now.

Senator McKELLAR. You personally believe in compulsory arbitration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I would not advocate compulsory arbitration. I say as between the two, between leaving it with nothing to settle it and compulsory arbitration, I would accept compulsory arbitration.

Senator STERLING. Short of compulsory arbitration, what would you think of compulsory investigation? That is, in case of a dispute between employers and employees, have a board of conciliation or mediation investigate and while that investigation was in progress make a strike or lockout, either one, an offense punishable, what would you think of that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I would not say that, because sometimes the men are forced, they are goaded on and their treatment forces them to strike, where if somebody can get to them and talk to them you can get them back and get them to wait until a decision is made. I would not say to make it an offense, but I believe some rules ought to be established where men would agree to work on a job until a decision has been reached.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not have any trouble in a mill like this Bethlehem mill among the men who were English-speaking men in carrying out that line of policy, would you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Your strike was called for September 29, and the other mills in the same industry had gone out on strike September 22. Suppose the unions, through you and the other men that they looked up to there, had requested the men, stated to them that at the request of President Wilson of the United States it was desired to postpone that strike date from September 29—and you tell me it was called on the 29th—to postpone that until after October 6; do you think the men in the Bethlehem plant would have struck in spite of your recommendation that they wait?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; not if we had had a direct appeal of that kind.

Senator PHIPPS. You could have made that appeal and the men would have complied with the request of President Wilson, you think?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to tell you that the men worked for that award from April to August, and when men have to wait month after month and not get any satisfaction, you may know how they feel. There wasn't any time when we could not go to them and get them to wait, and as I have said, all they got was, in the way of an answer, that they could not do anything for them unless the other mills would give the same rates of pay; but what the men wanted was the same rates of pay as paid in the Bethlehem shipyard, all the machinists asked for was what the Government said we should have last summer. Then Mr. Bent told them he could not do it unless the other steel mills granted it to their men. That is why they hooked up with the other steel mills.

Senator PHIPPS. You naturally know about Sparrows Point, as that is not very far—

Mr. WILLIAMS (interposing). It is quite a ways.

Senator PHIPPS. But do you know the character of the contracts at Sparrows Point plant, are they cost-plus contracts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are two plants there—the shipyard and the steel mill.

Senator PHIPPS. I am speaking of the shipyard. Do you know whether they are cost-plus contracts in the shipyard?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't know how they are handling it. They have extended the date every time when they would give assistance—

Senator PHIPPS. It occurred to me that the conditions under which the Bethlehem Co. was selling its product might be different in the two departments—that they might have cost-plus contracts in the shipyard and direct-price contracts in the mills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, we look upon it this way: All over the country in the shipyards there is the standard rate of pay. The Government has standard rates of pay in the navy yards and arsenals. Now, why should a man have to work on boring a 14-inch gun for 48 cents an hour, whereas he gets 86 cents an hour in the Government plant?

Senator PHIPPS. Eighty cents.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Here is the proposition. He may be making a little more than 48 cents an hour on one job piecework, and the

next contract he might be changed, and he doesn't know what he will get until he gets his pay slip. We have been trying to get standard rates of pay so that a man will know what he is going to get, and we don't see why the Bethlehem Steel Co. should not pay the same rates of pay for Government work in Bethlehem as they pay some other place. That is our contention.

Senator STERLING. Did men leave the steel mills to go to the shipyards?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; a lot of our men have left. It is pretty hard for us to tell where our men are now. I venture to say that at least 500 men have left.

Senator STERLING. There is nothing to prevent them leaving the steel mills and going to the shipyards?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Senator McKELLAR. What was the exact difference between the wages received and the wages recommended by the board of which ex-President Taft was the chairman?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, the wage rate—

Senator McKELLAR. For unskilled labor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You see they do not have any standard rate, and it makes it almost impossible to draw a correct comparison.

Senator McKELLAR. About what was the percentage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say this, that most machine-shop employees that are entitled to 72 cents do not receive 50 cents an hour under the rates of pay the latter part of last year, and a great many of them that are entitled to a 59-cent specialist rate received less than 40 cents an hour.

Senator STERLING. In connection with that, under what arrangement, if any, were they entitled to 72 cents an hour, one class, and another class to 59 cents an hour?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The War Labor Board specified that a man had to be an all-round mechanic and have worked for years at the trade and be able to work with or without drawings in order to qualify for the 72 cents an hour rate.

Senator McKELLAR. Has the Bethlehem Steel Co. definitely refused to pay?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, they have held up paying until such times as the Government pays them the money to pay the men.

Senator STERLING. Well, now, have they denied payment at the rate of 72 cents an hour to the men who had those qualifications—the qualifications you have described?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Refused it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They have refused it. The men made the requests just recently.

Senator STERLING. Was there any question as to their qualifications?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it is just a question that they would not go along with the wage scale.

Senator McKELLAR. What officer spoke for the company?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Bent, vice president. The chairman of the committee can verify this; he is over there. [Indicating.]

Senator STERLING. In this statement of yours you refer to a finding made by the board of the National War Labor Board—and in that

finding, which is quoted here, and I suppose this quotation is their exact finding, is it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will get a copy of it here.

Senator STERLING. They refer to the bonus system now in operation, that it "should be entirely revised or eliminated." Can you describe that bonus system?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; and I do not want you to think that I am trying to evade anything, but I do not believe there is any one man that can explain it right. If you would call the men from the War Labor Board, you would see nobody seems to be able to get it.

Senator STERLING. What is it based on fundamentally, is it based on the character of the work done or the number of hours overtime, or what?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A man has an hour rate. This is the way some of them are paid. A man has an hour rate, we will say it is 50 cents an hour, and they give him a certain amount of work to do. If he does the amount of work he is given in the regular working day, he can charge in 20 per cent more on his wages.

Senator STERLING. Because of the extra work he does?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; just because he fulfills the job that they have given him to do. He does not need to do anything extra.

Senator STERLING. But if he does not fulfill it he gets 50 cents an hour?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir;

Senator STERLING. That is settled?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. But if he completes that piece of work, then he gets the bonus?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know how that bonus is gauged, on which you stated he would get 20 per cent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is one way they pay it; but along will come a boss and say to a fellow, "You are charging nine hours on this job." Maybe there are two men on the same job and one is getting 20 per cent and the other fellow is getting an extra hour, or another fellow is getting 10 hours; and there are no two men paid alike. And we presented facts to show the representatives of the Government at the time this case was pending first that their system of paying men was so unjust that some men had so much time to do a job that the guns were already over in France on the battle field and the men were still sneaking time in on that particular job. We gave them both sides. We saw where a man was not given enough time to do some job, and yet other men were given so much time that they were charging after the job had left the shop. It is the system. Some men benefited by it.

Senator STERLING. It seems it was a lack of system rather than being a system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, it is just the way you want to look at it. Here is the award of the War Labor Board. [Producing award.]

Senator STERLING. Can you give some examples of how much different men are receiving under this bonus system? That is, take a man who is getting 50 cents an hour ordinarily, and under an understanding that if he completed the work he was to have this bonus;

how much did that man receive, how much did different men receive under that bonus system per day?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I would not say directly under the bonus system, because the bonus system and piece work and contract system were all interlocked; but we have known some men during the war to make as high as \$1 an hour. They were exceptions. The men will run somewhere between, you can say during the war when the production was at its maximum, when they had to dig in, as we say, their rates probably ran between 50 cents and 55 cents an hour; but it is hard to tell, I have not any direct evidence of that—I know the rates of the men that I have records of. I can show you several thousand men; but their pay I don't know only from a man saying well, he made pretty good last pay day, an average perhaps of 80 or 90 cents an hour.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you think the basis of this bonus system as an effort on the part of the company to differentiate between the work turned out by the different workmen who were doing the same character of work, that is to say, if a man was particularly skilled, that they had the feeling that he should receive more per hour than the man working alongside of him, even though he turned out the same number of pieces?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was just opposite to that. Here is a tool maker. He is an American citizen. He did not get any bonus, or a small bonus. Maybe he made 65 cents an hour all told. And over here on production work there might be an alien enemy making \$8 or \$10 a day, and that alien enemy could not read the blue prints. The American citizen was not getting it, and yet he had to furnish the brains so the other fellow could do the work.

Senator PHIPPS. How about the amount of work each of those two would turn out, was there a difference in the quantity?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The other man was on production and this man, the tool maker, was on maintenance. One was just as necessary as the other. What should have been done was to take from that fellow and see that the tool maker got what was due him. That is the trouble with this system.

Senator STERLING. You refer to the tool maker and compare him to the alien enemy, who was getting wages in excess of the tool maker. Now, were there many cases of that kind or were they isolated cases?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The general dissatisfaction was among the tool makers and the skilled workers. I do not know out of the 11,700 machine shop employes there during the war at one time, from the questionnaires we got, from the answers, of more than a dozen tool makers that got 80 cents an hour. They were particularly skilled men. But on the average they ran around 55 cents an hour.

Senator STERLING. How many alien enemies did you find that were getting excess wages?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, there were a good many alien enemies in there during the war. And if a man was, buying a house there through one of the agencies of the steel company, if he was an alien enemy and was buying a house he held his job to the end of the war, and the American citizen was laid off.

The CHAIRMAN. That raises the question of housing. We want to ask you about that. Does the company have houses there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many employees are housed in company houses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only a small percentage in Bethlehem.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a satisfactory method of housing?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, you take the city, the old city of Bethlehem, South Bethlehem, the houses there are of the old type. West Bethlehem is a newer city.

The CHAIRMAN. How are the company houses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. From what I know of them, they are an older type. I have known more of them from back in 1910 and a few years ago. Of course, recently I don't know whether the company took over part of the Government proposition or not, but the Government had a housing proposition that they lost \$1,440,000, or something, and dropped it over in West Bethlehem, the city of Bethlehem.

Senator McKELLAR. Is there any difference in the rents charged by the company and those charged by private owners?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't know about that.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you know anything about what rents they pay?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Rents are high in Bethlehem, that is all I know, because houses were very scarce. I live in Allentown, 7 miles away.

Mr. RUBIN. May this document go in evidence as showing Mr. Williams was opposed to the I. W. W.? May this go into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is not too long.

Mr. RUBIN. When was it issued?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some time in 1913 or 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you circulate that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I circulated it through Pennsylvania; yes.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

WHAT ARE YOU WORKING FOR, POLITICAL ACTION OR SYNDICALISM?—AN APPEAL TO EVERY BRANCH OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY IN PENNSYLVANIA.

DEAR COMRADES: The regular monthly bulletin, issued January 1 by our State committee, contains an appeal to the comrades to get together and resist the effort being made by some members in the organization to force upon us the anarchistic tactics of an antipolitical industrial organization.

It is well our State committee has taken action in this matter. For months the work of our organization has been obstructed and our State committee and secretary assailed, simply because they were trying to carry on the work of organization and education along the lines laid out by our State and national constitutions and platforms.

Our organization has grown wonderfully in the few years it has been managed by the State committee under the direction of local Berks County, until today we have the largest dues-paying membership of any of the States. Almost every speaker from other States who tours this State mentions the fact of the fine organization we have and the way our work is directed.

In spite of this success, what do we find? In certain sections of the State members of the I. W. W., taking advantage of the fact that we are pledged to support the industrial organizations in their struggle with the capitalist class, are trying to interpret this support to force us, as a political organization, to adopt their tactics also.

While the organizers of the I. W. W. have been assailing political action, just as soon as any of their members are put into jails they appeal to the Socialist Party to finance their fight through the courts to liberate them. The Socialist Party has always responded, despite the fact that the I. W. W. has officially refused to support us in the work of political organization.



Here are a few extracts from the constitution of the I. W. W. which explains their position on political action far better than anything else I could use. As a delegate to the recent State and National conventions I submitted these extracts to both conventions:

[Abstracts from I. W. W. constitution.]

Article VI, section 7, page 18: No funds of the general administration of the I. W. W. or subordinate parts thereof shall be used for political party purposes.

Article VII, section 12, page 20: No organizer of the I. W. W. while on the platform for this organization shall advocate any political party or political party platform.

Article IX, section 3, page 21: No general officer of the organization or parts thereof, or any salaried organizer, shall be permitted to accept any office in any political organization, nor shall they be allowed to accept any nomination for any political office except permission be granted by a referendum vote to the entire organization.

Article XIV, page 31:

#### POLITICAL PARTIES AND DISCIPLINE.

Whereas, the primary object of the Industrial Workers of the World is to unite the workers on the industrial battle field, and

Whereas, organization in any sense implies discipline through the subordination of parts to the whole and of the individual member to the body of which he is a part; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That to the end of promoting industrial unity and of securing discipline within the organization, the I. W. W. refuses all alliances, direct or indirect, with existing political parties or antipolitical sects, and disclaims responsibility for any individual opinion or act which may be at variance with the purposes herein expressed.

Now, Comrade, take each one of these sections of their constitution and read it carefully. Then take each one up in your branch meeting and try and find out whether it is possible for us, believing in political action, and organized for the purpose of educating the workers to the benefits of political action, to work in harmony with the I. W. W.

Repudiating political action, there is nothing left for them but the tactics of the anarchist, syndicalism. While our national constitution contains a section calling for the expulsion of any of our members who advocate sabotage or violence of any kind, these tactics are the methods used by the I. W. W.

While the I. W. W. insists on discipline within their organization regarding political action, the members of the I. W. W. within our organization place their individual opinion above the will of the majority and even go so far as to say our vote on article 1, section 6, was not an intelligent vote, as Comrade Merrick states in a recent issue of Justice.

Is our constitution to become a joke, and members within our organization who are filled with individualistic ideas allowed to dictate to our entire membership? This is the issue before us now, and we must face it and settle it before the fall campaign is started.

Unless we are able to face the capitalist class with a solid organization, working in harmony along the lines laid out for us by our constitution, we are not going to accomplish much, and in fact we are due for a serious reverse with the friction we have in the organization now. Any member who feels that he can not conscientiously support our constitution should withdraw from the party. If he refuses we must take action to make him obey the constitution, as the issue of majority rule against individualism is too great to pass without taking a decided stand.

At our national convention the I. W. W. used every means at their command to have the clause relating to violence and sabotage kept out of our constitution. In these efforts they were supported by the following delegates from Pennsylvania: Leroy F. Bruce, Allentown; Gertrude B. Hunt, Pittsburgh; Chas. W. Ervin, Philadelphia; Fred Merrick, Pittsburgh; Ed. Moore, Philadelphia; Wm. Parker, DuBois; Con Foley, Pottsville; A. G. Ward, Washington; Robt. J. Wheeler, Allentown, and John C. Young, Uniontown.

As we are to have an election for members of the national committee in a short time, all branches should find out just how these comrades stand on the

question of violence and sabotage now. The new national committee will elect the new national executive committee and also the national secretary, and it is useless to recall a member of the present national executive committee for advocating sabotage, and then elect a committee who will replace him with a syndicalist of the same type.

We must wake up our members to this fact. Every branch should elect a referendum committee who will try and get each member in good standing to vote on these referendums. The vast majority of our members are solid when it comes to supporting our constitution, only by neglecting to attend meetings, they miss the chance to vote on some very important questions.

Be sure the comrade you vote for stands for the principles of our organization, before those of the I. W. W., else we are going to have a hard fight to retain our organization.

Take this matter up and discuss it thoroughly in your branch meeting. Then if you are willing to support the State committee in their efforts to preserve the organization, by insisting that the laws governing our organization be obeyed, write to the State committee assuring them of your support and cooperation.

As stated before this is too serious a matter to let pass without taking action, and it is up to you. It is very unfortunate for us to have to temporarily neglect the work of organizing the unorganized by using all our efforts to retain what we have built up, but it has got to be done, and it is your duty to lend all the support you are able.

DAVID WILLIAMS,

*Member of Central Branch, Allentown, Local, Lehigh County.*

NOTE.—Local, Lehigh County, at a recent meeting, unanimously voted to support and cooperate with the State committee on any action they are forced to take to uphold the State and National Constitutions.

Senator STERLING. How many years did you belong to the Socialist party?

Mr. WILLIAMS. About eight years.

Senator STERLING. When did you quit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 1915, I believe in the spring of 1915.

Senator STERLING. Why did you leave the Socialist party?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I had to choose between the American Federation of Labor and the radical labor movement, and I had to choose between being an American and being controlled by some of these foreign elements in the Socialist party there, such as the Russian branch and the German branch and the Jewish branch. Those organizations made the rules of the association as much as the American branches.

Senator STERLING. And they are generally extremists, are they not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had to choose between the two, and I went with the Americans and the American Federation of Labor. But while I was in there I always fought the Haywood I. W. W. element.

Senator STERLING. Did you have any relations at all with Mr. Foster?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I never met Mr. Foster until after we called on the national committee. We had the national committee, as I told you in my statement, assist us in one of the hearings before the War Labor Board in September of last year, and we requested the national committee to send organizers to Bethlehem in the fall; but I never got in touch with Mr. Foster personally until, I guess, in May was the first time, at the steel works convention in Pittsburgh, the 25th of May of this year. I never knew of him and never read any of his works before, and his position to us is only as the highest secretary of the national committee. He spoke in our city last Sunday,

Mr. Foster did, and we got him there, and he made a very favorable impression with the public. If he has anything back in his head, as that fellow said, he didn't let it out, because we have only known him as the secretary of the committee. He has nothing to do with us. I am working direct under my own organization, and I am satisfied that if the A. F. of L. or—well, I haven't a lot of respect for these young newspaper men, but the editors manipulate things to suit themselves as to what the papers print.

Senator STERLING. Have you read Mr. Foster's work on Syndicalism and Trade-Unionism?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just in the daily papers.

Senator STERLING. You have not read his book?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Foster has been before the committee, and he has been questioned, and his book was referred to and he was questioned about it, and his views, and his former statements, had been put in the record, as to what he advised the I. W. W. people in a letter printed in "Solidarity," the organ of the I. W. W. So we know what Mr. Foster's affiliations have been and what his views have been as to the industrial problem, no matter what they may be now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me state this, however. A few years ago, President Wilson, while at Princeton, made a statement to the effect that the average Chinaman was a better citizen than a trade-unionist. Now, we do not hold that up against Mr. Wilson, because later on he showed us he had been a friend of the trades-union. So we forget some of these old things. A man that does not change his mind, something is the matter with his mind. And so they are not using this on Foster now because they only knew him when he became secretary of the steel strike, and we only know him of course as secretary of the committee. If he would come to our town and get away with any of that radical stuff we would get him right there.

Senator STERLING. Well, you know, do you not, that he has been the chief promoter of this strike and the bringing on of the strike of September 22, as against the President's request that it be postponed or that no action be taken until after the industrial conference was called for October 6—you know that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is what I know—I don't know your name—

Senator McKELLAR. Senator Sterling.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am pleased to meet you. This is what I know. I know that in Pittsburgh, May 25 of this year, there was a convention of steel workers called there then, and it took everything that Chairman Fitzpatrick had to stop that delegation of men from the ranks calling a strike at that time, and I can believe what they said, that they could not hold the men any longer. I heard the men from the ranks get up and berate the men and call them everything and say that they couldn't stand it any longer. So I believe they could not hold them any longer.

Mr. RUBIN. Did Foster have anything to do with controlling the men?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I don't think he did. I am willing to believe that the pressure of the men forced the organizers to report as they did, because I was at their convention and heard it as far back as May, demanding the right to strike then.

Senator STERLING. Now, Mr. Williams, did you hear the testimony of the sheriff of Allegheny County this morning?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A part of it.

Senator STERLING. Did you hear what he said in regard to the comparatively small number on strike in the Pittsburgh district at the present time? Let me ask you another question. How many are now out on strike at Bethlehem?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We figure at least 40 to 50 per cent are out yet. The company has disputed from the first week that we had 5 per cent out, as it has at every place.

Senator STERLING. Don't you think that the fact that so many are back at work in the Pittsburgh district, together with the fact that there are so many back at work in the Bethlehem mills, is in itself a refutation, in a way, of the idea that these men could not have been prevented from striking if the right kind of an appeal had been made to them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, if you put enough men in our sections, as I said awhile ago, there is not any doubt but what we could, if we had went right after our discussion, have stopped it.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it was the company's own fault in telling our men that they could not get anything unless the other steel mills got it.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. I call your attention to this fact, Mr. Williams, brought in the testimony, I believe, of either Mr. Foster or Mr. Tighe or Mr. Fitzpatrick, one of the three, when the President requested Mr. Gompers to postpone the strike, Mr. Gompers thereupon requested these three gentlemen, or one them—he requested Mr. Fitzpatrick to postpone it if conditions warranted it. The reply was that those three gentlemen conferred together, not with anybody else, not with any other persons, either strikers or others, but those three gentlemen conferred together and passed on it, without giving the rank and file or the general body of the people who were interested any chance at all to pass on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know anything about that. I have not heard that before. I do not dispute your word.

Senator McKELLAR. I can get the exact facts and read it to you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Here is an official copy of the minutes of the conference held by the various organizations in the Bethlehem plant, when we asked the national committee to take hold of the case.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Williams, unless you have something more, while Senator McKellar is looking up the matter he spoke to you about, we will go ahead with another witness.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. You have some gentlemen here with you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I would like to put the chairman of the committee, Brother Hodgson, on the stand.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. THOMAS W. HODGSON, BETHLEHEM, PA.

(Thomas W. Hodgson was thereupon sworn as a witness and testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. State your name.

Mr. HODGSON. Thomas W. Hodgson.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you add anything to what Mr. Williams has said?

Mr. HODGSON. In regard to the cause of the trouble, that is what you asked?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HODGSON. I would say, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, go ahead and do so.

Mr. HODGSON. On August 20th, when the wage committee of 13 was called into the office in front of Mr. Bent and Mr. Lewis, we found that there was a great deal of differences, for this reason: One class of men work 8 hours; another class of men work 10 5-12 hours; and another class of men work 12 hours. These men, the 12-hour men, had to work 4 hours longer than the 8-hour men. Do you understand me?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not believe I get that.

Mr. HODGSON. There are three different schedules, an 8-hour schedule, a 10 5-12 schedule, and there is a 12-hour schedule. The men that work the 8-hour schedule receive time and a half from that time on. The other men had to work the 10 5-12 hour schedule, he would receive time and a half from that time on. Another class of men work the 12-hour schedule, and they receive time and a half after 12 hours of work.

I called the attention of Mr. Bent to that, and asked him if he did not consider that it would draw a whole lot of dissatisfaction throughout the whole plant, just that alone. He turned to me and said, "How would you do it? How would you better it?" I said I was not here to tell him how to better it, but I could see the dissatisfaction which that will cause throughout the whole plant.

We let it go. There was nothing more said about it. Then through his statement he said what he had done in the Bethlehem plant he would have to do in all his plants, the schedule or the percentage that he put into effect, and he said he could not do it. In return I showed to him—he made remark, however, when he got done with his speech—he made the remark that what he done in his Bethlehem plant he would have to do in all his plants. I asked him would he reverse his statement, that what he had done in all his other plants would he do also in Bethlehem, and he asked me what I meant. I told him that I represented the molders, and I asked him would he pay the mills in Bethlehem what he paid them at Sparrows Point. He answered me that the work was so much more complicated at Sparrows Point than it was in Bethlehem.

I stated several facts to show him that his statement was not true. Nevertheless, the molders could not receive anything more out of it. The difference between the wages at Sparrows Point and the wages at Bethlehem—72 is the wage in Sparrows Point per hour; from 49 to 59 is the wage scale at Bethlehem. I went on to show him—

Senator STERLING (interposing). You mean for the molders?

Mr. HODGSON. For the molders and core makers. It is all in the foundry line. I went on to show him and to prove to him that during the war the Bethlehem plant was kept on ordnance work. He has sent his work to Sparrows Point, the work come back to the Bethlehem plant from Sparrows Point to be erected, and there was so much of that work which was rejected, and which was not fit,

it was not up to the standard, not near to the standard that the Bethlehem mechanics turned out. I showed him and proved that fact to him. I also proved the fact that some two or three years ago he sent work out from the Bethlehem foundry or the Bethlehem plant to Philadelphia, and as I understand it—I could not give you the names of the firms just now—but the work was that much complicated that when it come back to the Bethlehem plant to be erected it was all rejected, and, therefore, they did not pay for that work, and, as I understand it, the tool plant that done this work was bankrupted by it.

And I just went on to show that the work was so much complicated in the Bethlehem plant that he could hardly give it on the outside.

Those are the things that the mills in the Bethlehem plant took up. There are such a wide difference in the scale of wages in the two plants of the same company.

Senator STERLING. That is, the plants at Bethlehem and Sparrows Point?

Mr. HODGSON. And Sparrows Point.

Mr. RUBIN. You understand that he was the chairman of the collective bargaining committee, Senator?

Senator STERLING. I did not hear his full statement.

Mr. RUBIN. It is not in the record. You had better state that.

Mr. HODGSON. Chairman of the general committee.

Mr. RUBIN. For collective bargaining, isn't it?

Mr. HODGSON. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Let me just follow that up a little. For collective bargaining on the part of the molders alone or collective bargaining generally?

Mr. HODGSON. Of the whole plant.

Senator STERLING. The whole plant, for all the men in the different classes of work?

Mr. HODGSON. We were the subcommittee that Mr. Williams spoke of. There are three of us from a general committee.

Mr. RUBIN. I think you did not get that statement, Senator.

Senator STERLING. What was your last statement there?

Mr. HODGSON. There are three of us being from the general committee, the chairman, secretary, and one from the machinists, as a general committee to wait upon the company, from the whole committee of the whole plant.

Senator STERLING. Would that collective bargaining proposition or agreement embrace all classes of employees and provide the rates of pay each should receive—the molders, rollers, and other classes of employees?

Mr. HODGSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And your committee had jurisdiction of all, did it?

Mr. HODGSON. Yes; it did, because when the War Labor Board installed that, they met afterwards, the whole committee——

Senator STERLING (interposing). Installed what?

Mr. HODGSON. Installed the collective bargaining plan there. They are the ones that installed it, had the election and installed that plan of collective bargaining in the Bethlehem plant.

Senator STERLING. When did they install that plan?

Mr. J. W. HENDRICKS. May 1st the plan was signed.

Senator STERLING. May 1, 1918?

Mr. HENDRICKS. May 1, 1919.

Senator STERLING. Prior to that time there had been no collective bargaining or plan or system at the Bethlehem Steel Works?

Mr. HODGSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further you desire to offer?

Senator STERLING. Did you state how much you get as a molder?

Mr. HODGSON. As a molder I receive 59 cents per hour.

Senator STERLING. Working how many hours a day?

Mr. HODGSON. Eight hours for the last four months, about.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you have any bonus, when the bonus system was in effect?

Mr. HODGSON. I did not.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your average daily wage, in dollars and cents.

Mr. HODGSON. About four dollars and ninety some odd cents.

Senator STERLING. Do you quit at the end of eight hours?

Mr. HODGSON. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Or do you work overtime?

Mr. HODGSON. No overtime.

Senator STERLING. Are you allowed to work overtime?

Mr. HODGSON. I never asked to work overtime only on special occasions when there is a breakdown in the shop or something of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Eight hours is enough?

Mr. HODGSON. For me; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Williams, have you any other witness you desire to be heard?

We thank you very much, Mr. Hodgson.

Senator McKELLAR. This is the statement I wished to call Mr. Williams's attention to. It is found in a letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick, of date September 12, addressed to Mr. Gompers, in reply to Mr. Gompers' request that the strike might be postponed at the request of the President. I quote from that letter as follows:

Brothers Tighe, Foster, and myself considered your suggestion, and finally concluded that any vague, indefinite postponement would mean absolute demoralization and utter ruin for our movement.

If that statement is true, then they did not consult others, but consulted with the three men themselves, and declined to accede to the President's request.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that ought to be explained.

I was here in the city at the time the national committee met, and there was a telegram came in here from Mr. Tumulty, and after the committee broke up and had left was when the President's telegram came. But I do not know anything about that.

Senator McKELLAR. This is dated at Pittsburgh. Evidently those were the three men that passed on the question as to whether they would postpone the strike.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I would not even try to discuss it, because I do not know anything about it.

There is here the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Moy, if you want to verify any of the things about the plan of collective bargaining.

Senator PHIPPS. I may be wrong, but Senator McKellar has given an understanding of a thing which I think should be supplemented. I believe those gentlemen stated that they brought in the heads of the other different organizations in Pittsburgh before they reached that decision; that the three of them did not decide it among themselves. I think it is only fair to make that statement.

Senator MCKELLAR. The record shows that.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; the record shows that, but I wanted to call attention to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will put Mr. Moy on, just to make a statement about that plan of collective bargaining.

### TESTIMONY OF MR. BERNARD J. MOY, OF BETHLEHEM. PA.

(Bernard J. Moy was thereupon called as a witness and, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. There is no use in going over all of these matters that we have taken up with the other witnesses. If you can add anything to what they have said, please do so.

Mr. MOY. Well, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was chairman of the plan of collective bargaining in the Bethlehem Steel Co. for about six months. I quit there at the early part of last month, simply because the plan of collective bargaining was putting me down as a man that had sold out to the Bethlehem Steel Co. by a good many of the men. I did not see where it benefited the men in any way, for this reason: Take the plan of collective bargaining and going into the office, we would go to the officials of the company, and we could not get anything that would go into the men's envelopes. That was the main thing.

The War Labor Board had handed a collective bargaining decision down along with the machinists, a rule of 40 cents for helpers, 62 cents for second-class electricians and 67½ cents for first-class electricians.

Senator STERLING. That is, the War Labor Board had handed that schedule down?

Mr. MOY. Yes, sir; and there were about 75 per cent of the electrical workers in the Bethlehem Steel plant that received back pay and received this increase that the War Labor Board had handed down, and the other 25 did not receive it as yet.

Senator STERLING. Why?

Mr. MOY. I took that up with Mr. Bent, one of the vice presidents of the steel company, and he said that the United States Government did not forfeit the money to the Bethlehem Steel, which was about \$80,000 due them on paying this back pay proposition.

Senator STERLING. That is, that much due from the Government to the steel company?

Mr. MOY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. And that they were withholding the pay and the wages?

Mr. MOY. To these other 25 per cent; that they were not going to pay it until the Government put this money across.



But going into the plan of collective bargaining on the last of the month that I was there, we were called into the office, another fellow and I which was on the committee, when the war was over, and the plan of collective bargaining in effect, and says, "Now, boys, we are going to make a new rule." Now, understand that the War Labor Board had granted us 40, 62, and 67½ cents, time and half time for all overtime, double-time for Sunday and all legal holidays. We were told that there would be no more double-time for Sunday. There would be no more time and half time for overtime, but there would be time and half time for Sundays, starting at 6 p. m. Saturday afternoon and winding up at 6 p. m. Sunday.

Senator STERLING. Who was it that told you this; what officer?

Mr. MOY. The superintendent of the electrical department and the chief adjuster of the Bethlehem Steel, which we had to fetch our grievances to, Mr. Robinson. I told him to post a notice to that effect, and I says, "Tell the men." But the notice was never posted. I told some of the men just what was doing.

Senator STERLING. Were you a worker at that time in the mills?

Mr. MOY. Yes, sir. I was an armature winder in the Bethlehem Steel, in the electrical department, and I went and told some of the men, and they got up in the air. I told them to hold their horses a little bit; that we might be able to get something out of this.

So this wage committee went into the office—

Senator STERLING (interposing). What reason was assigned from that departure from the award that you were given by the National War Labor Board?

Mr. MOY. I do not quite understand you.

Senator STERLING. I understood you to say that, according to the ruling of the National War Labor Board you were to have this 40 cents, 60 cents, and 67½ cents an hour, with time and a half for any overtime, and double time for Sunday?

Mr. MOY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That was your understanding?

Mr. MOY. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Now, what reason was assigned by your superintendent for changing that regulation?

Mr. MOY. So far as I can understand, the orders come right from the main office. It was simply a cut of every man's wages.

Senator STERLING. And did you understand it to be in spite of and as against the regulation of the National War Labor Board or the understanding with the National War Labor Board?

Mr. MOY. There was no understanding with the National War Labor Board that the wages should be cut, but what a man had already gained I do not think that it should be taken away from him. The War Labor Board went out of existence, and it could not be taking it up any further, and they just simply come along and cut our wages.

Senator STERLING. And this was last May, after the National War Labor Board had gone out of existence?

Mr. MOY. After the War Labor Board had gone out of existence.

Now, on the other hand, before that we had three rates in that department—40, 62, and 67½ cents. We were also told that they

intended to put in different rates. They would run in this line: 40, 42½, 45, 47½, 50, 57½, and so on. And take that clear up from 40 cents to 67½ cents, it would leave 10 or 15 different rates in there.

Senator STERLING. Was that according to the different kinds of work?

Mr. Moy. Yes, sir. It is only this work in the electrical department of the Bethlehem plant. I will explain it.

Senator STERLING. Let me ask you, did this change pertain only to the electrical department, to which you are referring now, or was there a like cut in the wages of other men?

Mr. Moy. In the electrical department is the department that I am speaking of at the time.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. Moy. The superintendent is the man that put it up to us.

Senator STERLING. You do not know anything about the cuts in other departments?

Mr. Moy. No, sir. I am speaking of this. The operators in power houses and substations, and things like that, went to 62 cents an hour. That was their rate. In most all of the substations before that they had worked 12 hours a day and every other Sunday a 24-hour shift in order to change the shifts from day to night. The men work days this week and work nights the next.

Senator STERLING. I see.

Mr. Moy. And we have to work a 24-hour shift in order to do that. They received 62 cents. That last award they had taken them and put them on an eight-hour shift, which was three shifts. The repair men on the lines—what I mean by repair men are men that held up the repair work in the different shops, the different machine shops—they are just stationed right in there, and they take care of all break downs and things like that—they were rated at 62 cents an hour. Take the armature winders, and they were rated at 62 and 67½. The helpers received 40 cents.

Senator STERLING. And what were the hours per day of the men in that department?

Mr. Moy. Ten and five-twelfths, 8 and 12 hours a day. The operators in the power houses, eight hours a day. The repair men on the line, two shifts, continuous operation, 12 hours a day. Armature winders and all construction men, 10½ hours a day, 10 hours and 25 minutes.

Senator STERLING. And how much per hour, now, for those different classes? Was it 62 cents for all?

Mr. Moy. Sixty-two cents per hour for some and 67½ for others. You take some wiremen on the line, that we called construction men, they would get 62 and 67½.

Senator STERLING. I see.

Mr. Moy. So I quit the Bethlehem Steel here about the early part of last month, simply because the men would say, "He is getting a divvy out of it," and everything like that, and before my reputation would go, I simply left the Bethlehem Steel Co.

Senator PHIPPS. You quit before the strike was called?

Mr. Moy. I quit before the strike was called; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You belonged to the union, did you?

Mr. Moy. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. For how long?

Mr. MOY. I believe about two years.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you hold any office in the union?

Mr. MOY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything further from this witness?

Anything further you desire to say, Mr. Witness?

Mr. MOY. There is one thing that I would like to say. When this plan of collective bargaining was put into effect, we decided that our meeting in the main office, in front of Mr. Larkin, the assistant to the president, Mr. Lewis, the general superintendent, Mr. Robinson, the chief adjuster, we decided that they were going to explain this plan of collective bargaining to all the foremen and superintendents throughout the plant. They decided at that meeting that there should be a committee of four appointed to go around and see that the thing is explained right, that we would understand it just the same as the superintendents and foremen through the plant. I thought that was a very good idea and I told Mr. Larkin that I did, that I thought it would be a good idea for some man to explain this to the different departments through the plant, and that there would not be no hitch in that, that this department should see that they are running it this way here and that way there. They thought that would be a good idea, but when the time came—there are four division superintendents in the plant at Bethlehem. We went along and the first division superintendent that we come to was down in a shop. This plan of collective bargaining was explained to them; and I told this man, I says, "It is very plain," I says, "to the foremen, with the exception of one thing." I says, "Time and place." I says, "There is nothing like that in the plant of collective bargaining which we have signed." He says, "Well," he says, "He felt that would be a good thing." I says, "Time and place would mean this, that if any man had a grievance he would have to take it up on a certain day at a certain time." He says, "Yes." I says, "Well, that won't do; that won't go." I says, "We do not understand the plan that way." So we argued over it there a little while and he finally says, "All right."

The next day we ran into another division superintendent that explained it very clear to the men, satisfactory to the different superintendents and foremen through that department and it was all right. The next day we come along and we met this same division superintendent.

Senator STERLING. The man who had explained it satisfactorily?

Mr. MOY. No.

Senator STERLING. The former?

Mr. MOY. The first day, the man that wanted his time and place, and he checked this same thing in again. So I said to him, "Mister, I though that this thing was settled day before yesterday for once and for all."

The CHAIRMAN. Can not you just give us the conclusions in this matter, and not this detailed conversation?

Mr. MOY. There is not much more to say, only this here, that the plan of collective bargaining did not work out very satisfactory. But we stopped at this one point, when we got into this shop and put up this argument, I told him it would not go—and, to cut a long

story short, he simply turned to the foremen and the committee men who was in that shop, and in a kind of sarcastic way—I do not want to express myself right here in front of those ladies—and give out that if there was any man that was a Bolshevik or anything like that, he would have flew up in the air right there, but I left it go. I took it good natured, and did not say anything at all, as no foreman and superintendent can agree with me one day and criticize me right after that. I quit the Bethlehem Steel.

The CHAIRMAN. You quit the business then?

Mr. MOY. I quit the Bethlehem Steel.

Senator PHIPPS. How long have you been working in Bethlehem?

Mr. MOY. Eight years and half.

Senator PHIPPS. During that time did you have any difficulty in having any complaint adjusted by your superior to whom you had to report?

Mr. MOY. I never had any complaints to bring in to a foreman or superintendent, or anything like that. The only thing I ever went to a superintendent for was a change in work.

Senator PHIPPS. From your experience, then, what is your general impression? Do the men have any difficulty in getting to the higher-ups if they are not satisfied with their working conditions?

Mr. MOY. They never can. If they would go to the foreman and the foreman would turn them down, the superintendent would stay with the foreman. I must say this, that we do have a very good superintendent in the electrical department, in the line of trying to give the men a square deal.

Senator STERLING. I would like to ask one question in regard to this collective bargaining. As I understood you to say, there was no collective bargaining system prior to that recommended by the National War Risk Board, in Bethlehem.

Mr. MOY. Well, as far as I can understand it, there was never any kind of collective bargaining with the Bethlehem Steel until they decided in the meeting in New York that they would put the plan of collective bargaining in effect in Bethlehem Steel.

Senator STERLING. When was that?

Mr. MOY. That was the first meeting in May.

Senator STERLING. It was during the war, in May, 1918?

Mr. MOY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 1919, April 3.

Senator STERLING. 1919?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Was there any collective bargaining in this system there prior to that time?

Mr. MOY. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Then there was not any collective bargaining in pursuance of any recommendation by the National War Labor Board, was there? It was in April, 1919—I understood you to say a while ago that in May, 1919, the company was fixing different rates, and that was because of the fact that the National War Labor Board no longer had jurisdiction of the matter, the war being over, and the War Labor Board had discontinued its work.

Mr. MOY. The War Labor Board had discontinued its work, and this plan of collective bargaining, when they could not get together in New York—that was where the hearing was, wasn't it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. April 3.

Mr. STERLING. 1919?

Mr. MOY. In New York; and they came back to Bethlehem; and two days after that they called those committeemen into the offices that was elected under the award of the War Labor Board; there was a committee supposed to be in there, and I was one of the members elected, and we were called in, and we were called over to the main office, and they wanted to put in the plan of collective bargaining of their own in the Government plant, the one they had in some of the other plants, and I was at the meeting, and they wanted to drop—we were supposed to have 100; that is, one committee to every 100 men in the department; and they wanted to drop that down so that there would be only one committeeman to every 300 men. So I got up and I told them that I could not go along with them; that I was elected by the men; and that I would have to be dropped by the men; and finally this plan was worked out with the company and the men, and they came to Washington and put the finishing touch to it.

Senator STERLING. And that was on what day?

Mr. MOY. May 1.

Senator STERLING. 1919. Well, now, since that time has this plan of selective bargaining been abandoned at Bethlehem?

Mr. MOY. It has not been abandoned; no. The only thing is that the company did not live up to it; why they did not go and live up to, if they can go and call in two men in that department and say, "To-morrow it goes into effect, time and a half time," where we should receive double time, no matter what was the rate before, and they put it in—

Senator STERLING (interrupting). And is it the company's contention that they are no longer bound by that plan—

Mr. MOY (interrupting). No.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything further, Mr. Witness?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to make it plain to Senator Sterling about the collective bargaining proposition. The Bethlehem Steel Works had their own plan in their other plants; they had their own plans in their plants at Bethlehem, and in the shipbuilding plants they had the American Federation of Labor plan, and then this plan that we had that the War Labor Board put in they had, so that we had three plans. The date of that meeting was February 4 instead of April 4, in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. MOY. I want to thank you gentlemen for the courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. There are a couple of witnesses here from Gary whom we will now hear.

#### TESTIMONY OF MR. L. W. McNAMEE.

(L. W. McNamee was thereupon called as a witness, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

Mr. ASHMEAD. Mr. McNamee can testify about the general conditions and the number of men on strike and the nationalities of those on strike.

The CHAIRMAN. *Al right.* What is your position with the company there?

Mr. McNAMEE. I am the auditor for the Gary work of the Illinois Steel Co. and officer of the Gary Land Co.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many men are there employed in those works?

Mr. McNAMEE. We had prior to the strike approximately 10,000 working there.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many went on strike?

Mr. McNAMEE. About 75 per cent of those.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many are out now?

Mr. McNAMEE. We have about 60 per cent, or a little better, back at work at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, 75 per cent—were they all union men that went out on strike?

Mr. McNAMEE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of the 10,000 are union men?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, I do not know that I can answer that very accurately.

The CHAIRMAN. You can not give us that estimate?

Mr. McNAMEE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that some of those who went out were not union men?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How many have you working out there to-day?

Mr. McNAMEE. We have working to-day about 6,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many of the 10,000 that are working for you in that plant are non-English speaking people? How many are foreigners?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, foreigners, we term foreigners—foreign born—

The CHAIRMAN. Regardless of whether or not they have been naturalized?

Mr. McNAMEE. We have about 60 per cent of the foreign born, and of that 60 per cent about one-third of them are naturalized and two-thirds of them are not naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get that. About one-third are naturalized?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And of the 10,000 then 6,000 are foreign born?

Mr. McNAMEE. Six thousand are foreign born.

The CHAIRMAN. And 2,000 are naturalized?

Mr. McNAMEE. And 2,000 are naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. And about 4,000 of them are not?

Mr. McNAMEE. And about 4,000 of them are not.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have 4,000 unnaturalized foreign-born people working there?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many of those speak the English language?

Mr. McNAMEE. We divide them as between the English speaking and the non-English speaking, and we draw the line as to whether they can understand enough of the English language to know what they are talking about when they are given instructions and directions.

The CHAIRMAN. How many can understand the English language and how many can not understand the English language?

Mr. McNAMEE. We have something like 5 per cent classed as non-English speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. You have 5 per cent classed as non-English speaking?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That do not understand English at all?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that the rest of them can understand the English language?

Mr. McNAMEE. They can understand more or less English. They do not speak it fluently.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many understand very little English or practically none?

Mr. McNAMEE. Quite a large number. I do not think I can estimate that off hand.

Senator McKELLAR. Would you say that half of them?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes; I would say that more than half of them can understand it fairly well.

Senator STERLING. And you say that about 5 per cent of them can not understand the English language so that they can understand the directions and instructions given?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And of the 10,000, 6,000 are now at work?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And of those men who are now at work, how many of them are foreigners?

Mr. McNAMEE. We figure that about 85 per cent of the Americans are back at work. We treat as Americans the native born, and about 14 or 15 per cent of the foreign born are back at work, and the balance of them are out.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of the Americans went out in the first place?

Mr. McNAMEE. I would have to search some in order to get that data. I can not tell that without referring to the data that I have here.

Mr. ASHMEAD. He has the figures there.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they in tabulated form, so that they can be put into the record?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, I just took memoranda, I just made up a memorandum, I did not have time to prepare—I was called here in a hurry, and I did not have time to prepare in good form the data, and I just took a memorandum.

The CHAIRMAN. And those all are memorandum figures?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You can put those into the record.

Senator PHIPPS. You have common labor—how much do you pay—42 cents an hour, do you?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And time and a half for over eight hours?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your average daily rate to all of the employees?

Mr. McNAMEE. The average of the whole plant is around \$6 a day, as I remember the figures; I have got that here. What was the information you wanted, gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN. The figures of the English speaking and the different nationalities.

Senator McKELLAR. I believe it would be all right for him to put the figures in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a complicated table that he has?

Mr. ASHMEAD. Yes; it is for this purpose. It shows all about those at work—

Mr. McNAMEE. We show here on September 15, for instance—this is a sample of nationality statements—on September 15 we had 10,465 men, and of those 10,386 are English speaking and 197 are non-English speaking, those who can not understand English practically at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that of that number that large a proportion can understand the English language?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir; and some of them in a very limited way.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. McNAMEE. I say that some of them can understand English only in a very limited way.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they know anything about our American institutions? Do they know anything about—have they studied our American history?

Mr. McNAMEE. No.

Senator McKELLAR. How many can read the English language?

Mr. McNAMEE. That I can not say.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many can read the English papers?

Mr. McNAMEE. Practically few of them.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. McNAMEE. Practically few of them can read the English papers—of the foreign born.

The CHAIRMAN. So when you say that one hundred and some odd out of 10,000 people there, you mean there are a vast number who can not read English?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And those men are included in the 197—

Mr. McNAMEE. They are in the 197.

Senator McKELLAR. I will say that the Senate committee at one time talked to about a couple of hundred of the men and only three or four had any knowledge of the English language sufficient to be understood.

The CHAIRMAN. How many employees are there who know who George Washington was?

Mr. McNAMEE. That I could not say.

Senator McKELLAR. How many out of the 10,000?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, probably a good many.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been presented to us that the great mass of these people can not understand or speak or write the English language. You have given us your statement that 197 out of the 10,000 can not speak and write the English language—

Mr. McNAMEE. I mean that they can not understand it at all.

Senator McKELLAR. They can not understand any language?



Mr. McNAMEE. No; they can not understand the English.

The CHAIRMAN. Can not understand the English.

Senator McKELLAR. Isn't it true that some 50 per cent of them can not understand the English language enough to read and write it and study it and learn what this country really stands for?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a great many of them in that position.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any night schools going on for the teaching of the English language?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of them are attending those night schools?

Mr. McNAMEE. The public schools are conducting night schools, have night classes, and the Y. M. C. A. are conducting night schools and have night classes, and we have had at different times at the plant night schools, night classes.

The CHAIRMAN. And all of these organizations are ready and co-operating, including your plant, in a movement to teach these people the English language?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a 12-hour day there, have you?

Mr. McNAMEE. We have for a part of the employees.

The CHAIRMAN. And a man can not work 12 hours a day and study the English language. Does not that enter into any plans of Americanization, that you have to have reasonable hours of work, in order to enable a man to go to night school?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, we find quite a number of them that are taking the night-school courses in the public schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many of those are in those schools?

Mr. McNAMEE. I do not know; I do not know the attendance of those recently.

Senator McKELLAR. And if you were to establish an eight-hour day of work, not for the purpose of computing wages, but eight hours of work, and if you had good schools, it would not take long to Americanize them, would it?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, we pride ourselves on our schools in Gary. They are known pretty generally throughout the country.

Senator McKELLAR. But if the great body are unable to read American newspapers and to understand the American language, why, you have not accomplished a great deal, up to date, have you?

Mr. McNAMEE. Our public-school officials made a statement a year ago that they had as many students in the night-school classes there in Gary as they did in Chicago.

Senator McKELLAR. Still you have to take into consideration the fact—

Mr. McNAMEE (interrupting). We are making very serious efforts along that line.

Senator STERLING. What do you think about the inclination of the adult workers to take advantage of these night schools and attend them? Is there a general feeling among them that they should attend the night schools?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, with quite a number of them; yes.

Senator McKELLAR. But if you could give them notice that unless they learned the English language in two years from the passage of a bill they would be deported back to their own country, do you think they would learn the English language within the two years?

Mr. McNAMEE. I believe more of them would.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you think that most of them would?

Mr. McNAMEE. I believe they would.

Senator PHIPPS. What about the sanitary conditions in the plants? Are they carefully looked after?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Do they have adequate—do they have bathrooms?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, they have shower baths in the departments and toilets, toilet facilities, and washing facilities—

Senator PHIPPS. And do they have lockers for the men's clothes?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. In which to put their clothes?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And what about the housing conditions?

Mr. McNAMEE. I believe that the housing conditions in Gary are good.

Senator PHIPPS. It is a comparatively new manufacturing town, as I understand it.

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How does it compare with other manufacturing locations?

Mr. McNAMEE. We have houses there that are better in Gary than they have in other manufacturing towns.

Senator McKELLAR. How many houses do you rent to your employees?

Mr. McNAMEE. I have the number here. The company has built 878 dwelling houses, accommodating 1,208 families.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, what sized house, and what is your rate of rental?

Mr. McNAMEE. Those houses rent according to their character and size and capacity, etc., and cost from \$16 to \$17 a month up to \$45 a month.

Senator McKELLAR. Up to \$45 a month?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. And how many rooms are in the \$16 a month houses?

Mr. McNAMEE. Four-room houses and five-room houses, the \$16 a month houses.

Senator McKELLAR. And for \$45 a month, how many rooms are in those \$45-a-month houses?

Mr. McNAMEE. Ten-room houses.

Senator McKELLAR. Ten-room houses?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And \$25 a month—

Mr. McNAMEE (interrupting). Now, you know that some of those houses are for the superintendents and the foremen, and men of that sort. We have very few of the ten-room, but quite a number of the eight-room and the seven-room and the six-room houses, of a good type of construction, and they are renting around \$25 a month.

Senator PHIPPS. Gary itself can not house all the employees of the plant, can it?

Mr. McNAMEE. In their own houses?

Senator PHIPPS. No; I mean that Gary has not the houses available to house all of the men at Gary, and many of the workmen come and go from nearby places, or nearby communities?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes; some come and go—

Senator McKELLAR. Let me ask you, Mr. McNamee, how do the rentals compare with the rentals charged in nearby towns, and the rentals in Gary itself outside of company houses?

Mr. McNAMEE. The company's rentals are much less than the outside rentals.

Senator McKELLAR. To what extent, generally speaking?

Mr. McNAMEE. Generally speaking, our rentals run per room per month from \$4 to \$6 per room per month.

Senator McKELLAR. And do you rent all of your houses?

Mr. McNAMEE. No; we sell a number of them to employees on partial payments.

Senator McKELLAR. You either rent or sell?

Mr. McNAMEE. We either rent or sell.

Senator McKELLAR. And are all of the houses taken? You have no vacant houses?

Mr. McNAMEE. Very few.

Senator STERLING. On what terms are those payments, where you sell the houses to the employees? What are the terms?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, the terms are 10 per cent down and the balance over a period of 10 years, with monthly payments, with interest at 5 per cent on the unpaid balance.

Senator PHIPPS. Are you sure about the interest being at 5 per cent? It has been stated here that it is 6 per cent.

Mr. McNAMEE. I am sure. I know that, because I handle the contracts.

Senator PHIPPS. You handle the contracts?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes; and 5 per cent is interest on what we call the house contract. Perhaps you are confusing that with the loans which we are making to the employees.

Senator PHIPPS. For what purpose do you make loans to employees?

Mr. McNAMEE. We make loans to employees to enable them to build their own houses, if they do not want to buy the company houses. We have something over \$2,000,000 on 75 per cent of the cost basis.

Senator PHIPPS. On 75 per cent of the cost, you loan up to 75 per cent of the cost?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir; and we have loaned in that way more than \$2,000,000.

Senator STERLING. And on what time do you make those loans?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, they are made usually for five years at 6 per cent interest. Those are usually made for five years.

Senator STERLING. And with the privilege of extending?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. In case payment is not completed?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you ever had to foreclose on any of those houses?

Mr. McNAMEE. Not so far.

Senator MCKELLAR. How long have you had the system working?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, we have been loaning money on that plan since 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess that is all, Mr. Witness.

Mr. ASHMEAD. The witness knows something about intimidation out at Gary.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us about that. Was there any intimidation there?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir; considerable of it.

The CHAIRMAN. What did that consist of?

Mr. McNAMEE. Well, some of the pickets were very energetic in trying to make men get off the street cars. About two or three hundred yards before you get to the mill on Broadway, there are grade crossings, where they cross the railroad, where the street car men have to get off and see that the track is clear before making the crossing, before crossing the grade crossing. At this time the pickets would sometimes try to drive the men off the cars, and to push them off of the cars——

The CHAIRMAN. Was that before or after October 5?

Mr. McNAMEE. That was after October 6.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have had no trouble since troops went there?

Mr. McNAMEE. No; we have had no trouble since the troops were there; that has been stopped.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any more than one riot there where the people have been hurt, one riot?

Mr. McNAMEE. There was one riot. There has been no serious riot aside from that one.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any shots fired?

Mr. McNAMEE. There were no shots fired at all. The people congregated there where the street car was blocked on account of the Michigan Central crossings, and the men tried to pull some of the workers off the cars, and that started a disturbance. They called on the police, and the police, I understand, used their clubs in dispersing the crowd, but no shots were fired.

The CHAIRMAN. You had a parade there contrary to the mayor's orders?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And was there any disorder at that time?

Mr. McNAMEE. There was quite a big crowd of people parading down there contrary to the mayor's orders. He had ordered that there would be no more open-air meetings and no more parades. We had a very few of the militia——

The CHAIRMAN. And that resulted in disorder?

Mr. McNAMEE. No, there was no riot.

The CHAIRMAN. And after that the Federal troops were called in?

Mr. McNAMEE. After that the Federal troops were called in.

The CHAIRMAN. So that altogether there has not been a great deal of disorder accompanying the strike?

Mr. McNAMEE. There was only one case of a bad riot.

The CHAIRMAN. Only one case?

Senator McKELLAR. And there were not any shots fired?

Mr. McNAMEE. There were no shots fired.

The CHAIRMAN. And if there is such a thing as a peaceful strike, it has been recently peaceful?

Mr. McNAMEE. I have taken a number of affidavits in regard to intimidation.

The CHAIRMAN. You have?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir; I have some of them, samples of them.

The CHAIRMAN. I suggest that you leave those affidavits with us and let the committee look them over and determine whether they should go into the record.

(The following affidavits, being typical of approximately 40, are printed in full in the record as follows:)

STATE OF INDIANA,  
*County of Lake, ss:*

Adam Kleindorf, being duly sworn, on oath says that he resides at 448 Tyler Street, in the city of Gary, which property he has owned for about three years; that he is now and for more than two years has been an employee of the Illinois Steel Co.; that his check number is 15957; that he lives with his wife and three children at above address; that on September 29, 1919, about 5.30 a. m., while affiant was on his way to work at the Illinois Steel Co., and while he was on Fifth Avenue between Van Bureau and Jackson Streets, an automobile drove up and stopped opposite affiant and two men jumped out of it, and one said to affiant, "Where are you going?" Affiant replied, "Going to work." The man then said, "Where?" Affiant replied, "To the mills." The man then said, "So you are scabbing it?" Affiant replied, "I'm not scabbing; I am not a union man; I am satisfied with my job and want to work." Affiant then was struck from behind by the other man, back of the left ear, knocked down, and rendered partly unconscious. The man began to kick him while down, and affiant yelled. The men then jumped in car and drove off, saying, "If you go back, you son of a bitch, we'll get you." Affiant could not see the number of the automobile nor did he recognize either one of his assailants. Affiant says he is anxious to work and intends to work, but feels he will do so at the risk of bodily harm, or that he or his family may be injured.

ADAM KLINEDORF.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of September, 1919.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM H. FITZGERALD,

*Notary Public.*

Commission expires June 19, 1920.

STATE OF INDIANA,  
*County of Lake, ss:*

Personally appeared before me the undersigned, a notary public in and for said county and State, one Helen Momot, wife of Frank Momot, who, being duly sworn, deposes and saith:

That about 12 noon, September 23, 1919, there appeared at my residence, 1945 Delaware Street, Gary, Ind., a delegation of 10 men or more, representing themselves as union men belonging to the Iron and Steel Workers' Union at Gary, and each wearing a badge so designating them.

That affiant was informed by the men that if her husband, the said Frank Momot continued to work at the plant of the Illinois Steel Co. Gary Works, her husband would be killed and her home destroyed.

HELENOR MOMOT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 23d of September, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

JOHN M. SWEENEY, *Notary Public.*

My commission expires January 16, 1922.

GARY, IND., October 1, 1919.

McCool,

553 Maryland, City:

We know you work in the mills and scabbing against us, and we want you out of there without trouble, and trouble we will have if you don't come out. Now, this is no simple thing, but a very serious thing, and you are watched and will be *got* if you don't get out, and get out quick. Now, just stay out this evening and show yourself on the streets, and you need not fear any harm, but otherwise *look out*.

STATE OF INDIANA,

County of Lake, ss:

John McCool, being duly sworn, on oath says that he resides at 553 Maryland Street, in the city of Gary, Ind., which premises he is purchasing on a contract from the Gary Land Co., on which purchase he has paid \$1,600, the full purchase price being \$4,700; that he is now and for more than five years last past has been an employee of the Illinois Steel Co., at Gary, Ind.; that he has continued at his employment to date, notwithstanding the so-called strike; that he belongs to no union; that he resides with his wife and child at above address; that there was delivered to him by United States mail during the forenoon of October 2, 1919, a letter unsigned and hereto attached with its envelope; that said letter is in words as follows:

" GARY, IND., October 1, 1919.

" We know you work in the mills and scabbing against us, and we want you out of there without trouble, and trouble we will have if you don't come out. Now, this is no simple thing, but a very serious thing, and you are watched and will be *got* if you don't get out, and get out quick. Now, just stay out this evening and show yourself on the street, and you need not fear any harm, but otherwise *look out*."

Affiant does not know the writer thereof.

JOHN MCCOOL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 2d day of October, 1919.

[SEAL]

WILLIAM H. FITZGERALD,

Notary Public.

My commission expires June 19, 1920.

STATE OF INDIANA,

County of Lake, ss:

Helen Carr, being duly sworn, on oath says that she lives with her husband, Nick Carr, and their two children at 1343 West Eighteenth Street, in Gary, Ind., which premises she and her husband own; that her husband is now and for more than four years has been an employee at Gary of the Illinois Steel Co.; that he is not a member, nor ever has been a member, of any labor union; that he has continued at work for the steel company notwithstanding the so-called strike; that about 1 p. m. on October 5, 1919, one Dan Garlich, whom affiant is advised lives at 950 Ellsworth Place, in Gary, came to affiant's house and called upon affiant and said to her in the native language of affiant and the said Garlich, which is Austrian, "Is Nick working?" Affiant said, "Yes." Garlich then said, "It will cost him a lot if he don't come out of the mill and quit, for if he don't I will bring my crowd with me and tear off your porch and break the windows and tear your house down." Affiant says she repeated this talk to her husband, Nick Carr, and that she is terrorized and put in great fear by reason of such threats. Affiant says she has heard read the foregoing in the Austrian language and same is true.

YEL CAR.

Nick Carr, being sworn, on oath says he truthfully and fully read and translated into Austrian language the foregoing to Helen Carr.

NICK CAR.

Subscribed and sworn to by Helen Carr and Nick Carr before me this 6th day of October, 1919.

[SEAL]

WILLIAM H. FITZGERALD,

Notary Public.

My commission expires June 19, 1920.

STATE OF INDIANA, *County of Lake, ss.*

Jesse C. Yoder, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he lives at Broadway Hotel and is a single man; that he is employed by the Illinois Steel Co. as car inspector, and has been employed by Illinois Steel Co. since the 6th day of June, when he was released from the United States military service.

This morning at about 6 a. m. I was on my way to the restaurant to get my breakfast when I met Lilburn A. Titus; he was in a machine coming north on Broadway opposite the Gary Hotel, when he jumped out of the machine and hollered at me. He said, "You hadn't better go to work down there; you are scubbing the job." I told him that I was not scubbing the job. He said, "We investigated and found out that you were." I told him I wasn't, and he said, "You have always been a union man." I told him, "There was no use you and me talking about this; I haven't bothered no one," and I walked down the street, and he called me four or five vicious names and then said if he ever caught me on a side street he would kick my head in, or words to that effect, so I said, "All right," and went on.

JESSE C. YODER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public in and for the county and State aforesaid, this 29th day of September, 1919.

[SEAL.]

JOHN M. SWEENEY, *Notary Public.*

My commission expires January 16, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you leave those affidavits with us and let the committee look them over and determine whether they will be placed in the record?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do these affidavits refer to cases where men went out on strike because of threats, or have stayed out on strike because of threats against them?

Mr. McNAMEE. Yes, sir. They come around to their houses, and sometimes when men were at work, and they tried to intimidate their families by threatening to burn down their houses and kill them if the men did not come out of the mill, and in one case also I heard of an assault, where a man was assaulted.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you leave those affidavits with us and let us determine about putting them in the record.

Mr. ASHMEAD. How much of this other data does the committee want?

The CHAIRMAN. Leave them and we will look them over and see.

Mr. ASHMEAD. May I ask this witness a question as to whether there have been any strikebreakers employed in Gary?

Mr. McNAMEE. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. No men have been brought in from the outside?

Mr. McNAMEE. The companies made no effort to bring in strikebreakers at all.

Senator McKELLAR. How many colored men have you got working for the company?

Mr. McNAMEE. We have now about 1,400.

Senator McKELLAR. Some of them are deputized as sheriffs?

Mr. McNAMEE. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you another witness here?

Mr. ASHMEAD. We have Mr. Wilson.

Mr. McNAMEE. I have some photographs, if you gentlemen care to look at the character of houses the company put up there.

The CHAIRMAN. You may leave them.

## TESTIMONY OF MR. S. E. WILSON, OF GARY, IND.

S. E. Wilson, of Gary, Ind., having been first duly sworn by the Chairman, testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business?

Mr. WILSON. Heater.

The CHAIRMAN. You are working now in the steel plant at Gary?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What wages do you receive?

Mr. WILSON. About \$3,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you born in this country?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a married man?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any family?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you own your home?

Mr. WILSON. I am buying it on the partial-payment plan.

The CHAIRMAN. From the company?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you like that way of doing?

Mr. WILSON. Fine. I have lived in a number of steel towns and I think it is the finest plan ever invented for a man to own his own home. I pay \$40 a month, and it would cost me \$50 at least, that character of a house.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got a front porch on your home?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When you sit out on your front porch and put your feet up on the rail you never think much about being a Bolshevik, do you, when you own your own home?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How many hours a day do you work?

Mr. WILSON. Twelve hours.

Senator PHIPPS. Is that continuous? You have to be on the job, but you are not actively employed all the time, are you?

Mr. WILSON. Oh, no. I suppose my work is so I could probably do it all in four or five hours, if it could be so arranged. It is not any physical work I have to do.

Senator PHIPPS. The steel is charged into the furnace by machinery?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And drawn from the furnace by machinery?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Your main duty is to know that it has been brought up to the proper temperature and is ready for rolling, not overheated, and things of that sort?

Mr. WILSON. Exactly; yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What is the size of the mill that your heating furnace is connected with?

Mr. WILSON. Sixty-inch universal platen.

Senator PHIPPS. That is a pretty wide universal?

Mr. WILSON. The largest in the country, I believe.

Senator PHIPPS. About what is the weight of the slab that you ordinarily handle for that 60-inch mill?



Mr. WILSON. Our average weight would probably be 4,000 pounds, but the range is from 2,000 to 20,000.

Senator PHIPPS. A steel slab weighing as much as 10 tons?

Mr. WILSON. We roll them over 160. That is a new mill—29,000 pounds.

Senator PHIPPS. How many men are employed under you in taking care of this particular furnace?

Mr. WILSON. Four.

Senator PHIPPS. About what do they make?

Mr. WILSON. The lowest-paid man on the furnace is \$6 a day; the next man probably gets \$7, and the operator about \$8, maybe \$8.25. We have a bonus system in effect. Men get a guaranteed rate; then, with the bonus, if we make a large tonnage, we get better than that. It is a sort of incentive to the men.

Senator PHIPPS. That is one point I wanted to bring out a little. What is your opinion of the justice of the bonus system? Do you believe in it as being the proper thing?

Mr. WILSON. Oh, yes; I am a firm believer in that.

Senator PHIPPS. It has been complained that the bonus system has the effect of driving a man beyond his proper physical capacity for doing work?

Mr. WILSON. I do not know what the character would be in other plants, but in Gary all men get a fair wage. Understand this \$6 is the day rate. We get that if we do not roll a pound; and myself, I get \$10.50 if we do not roll a pound. I am guaranteed that much, but the bonus rate I get, the highest rate on the furnace, does not exceed, sometimes probably \$3, but that is very unusual, probably \$1.50 or \$2 would be a fair average.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you noticed that objectionable feature that I have brought to your attention, that the men complain because you want to earn a bonus—as, for instance, being in charge of the hands, that you make your men work harder than you should or would work?

Mr. WILSON. In the mill I work in there is nobody has to work very hard. It is mainly all machinery, and the men that do work continuous have other men to relieve them, like we have charging operators, there is one of those fellows working all the time when the mill works, but there are two of them working.

Senator PHIPPS. So they spell each other?

Mr. WILSON. They spell each other, and there is nobody that has to work very hard in Gary that I see.

Senator PHIPPS. What do you find about the operating conditions; is there anything to complain of, or does the company handle things in as good a manner as you think could be expected?

Mr. WILSON. I think they handle them fine there. I have no fault to find at all. I think there would not have been any trouble at all if we had not had the agitators come to Gary.

Senator GERRY. Now, as to your crew. Does your crew complain of having to work 12 hours, that they think it ought to be cut down to eight and three-shifts system?

Mr. WILSON. I have heard some of them say that they would like to have eight hours, and it probably would be all right, but these foreigners have been led to believe that they will get the eight hours with considerable more pay than they are working now for 12 hours, and through their ignorance they are an easy prey for the agitators

that came there from other places and told them that they would get probably \$1 or \$1.25 an hour where now they are getting maybe 60 or 70 cents an hour to work eight hours, and it would only cost them \$3 to join the union and get all that money with their \$3. Naturally they want to join the union.

Senator PHIPPS. Did you ever belong to a union yourself?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Is the three-shift-day plan feasible in your plant—eight hours?

Mr. WILSON. I do not know whether they could get the men, the skilled labor, to do that.

Senator McKELLAR. How about the unskilled labor?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I do not know. I do not know that either. Men are not plentiful now; but it would have to come by degrees. They could work to that. I believe that could be worked to.

Senator McKELLAR. Would it not be very much better if they had a legal eight-hour day and not permit the men to work longer than that? I am not speaking of the wages now, I am just speaking of the method of working or the length of time of working. It seems to me that 12 hours a day is a good long period in which to work.

Mr. WILSON. That is true, 12 hours is a long day, and 8 hours would be much nicer if men would get a living wage, but that is a broad question—a living wage.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think you will ever fully educate and Americanize these men, as long as they have to work 12 hours a day?

Mr. WILSON. My experience in millwork is you can't hardly induce these men to go to school and embrace the opportunity to go to night school after they are 25 years of age. These young men, they want to go; they are very anxious to go; but men who get 25 or 30 years old are not easily persuaded.

Senator McKELLAR. Do you think that if they were given notice that they must learn to speak the English language or be deported within two years, do you think they would learn the English language?

Mr. WILSON. I think they would, the large majority of them, under those conditions.

Senator McKELLAR. If they had the schools?

Mr. WILSON. And if they did not, why I think the country would be well rid of them.

Senator STERLING. How about the children of these foreigners, do they generally attend the public schools?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Are any of them taught in foreign languages?

Mr. WILSON. No; unless it would be in the parochial schools. I am not familiar with that part. But in the public schools we have a fine school system, which I suppose you are aware of, in Gary, and the foreign element have every advantage—that is, the children.

Senator McKELLAR. Do they still have parochial schools?

Mr. WILSON. Oh, yes.

Senator McKELLAR. That is the Greek Church?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I don't know. That is down in the foreign part of the town. I am not familiar with conditions. I go down there occasionally, but I am not familiar, but I know there are parochial schools down there.

Senator STERLING. Is there a compulsory education system there?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. So the children are required to attend the English schools?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you attend any of the meetings of the workers during the strike?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. The Americans whom you know in the mill, were they asked to join the union?

Mr. WILSON. I don't think so. Now, in the particular department I work in, with probably one or two exceptions, all the American men are working. It was only the foreigners who struck, and a great many of them were intimidated. I don't know just what the figures are, but that is those of the foreigners that belonged to the union and those that were intimidated.

Senator PHIPPS. Did any of those foreigners tell you they were out simply because they were afraid to go to work?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. So you know that?

Mr. WILSON. Oh, that is common knowledge; everyone knows that; yes. Any number of them told me. I know one man that worked on the furnace that on the 22d of July he was to work nights, and two men went and informed his wife she would be a widow if he worked on the night of the 22d, and then they came and notified him they would burn his house down if he worked.

Senator STERLING. Did you hear any statements made there on the streets when there was a considerable crowd around in regard to the workers taking over the property of the company?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir; I did not attend any meetings, and I have been working right along and I don't have much time to loaf on the streets.

Senator STERLING. Do you know what the belief of some of the foreigners was in regard to that?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I do; I know. Some of them have been led to believe that—they think if they stay out long enough that they will be able to take the works. They have been led to believe the works belong to them.

Senator STERLING. On what do you base that statement—that they have been led to believe that? What is the foundation for that?

Mr. WILSON. Why, I have heard them say that.

Senator PHIPPS. Have any of them said their union cards would entitle them to ride on the street cars, on the railroads, without paying fares?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir; I have not heard that.

Senator PHIPPS. But you have heard them say that the mills would be run by the committees, that there would be no superintendents or foremen?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir. I don't think that is true of the intelligent men, or the more intelligent foreigners. I think that is probably just the Russians, and probably the Austrians. I don't believe that is true of all of them.

\*Senator PHIPPS. Do you know anything of their organizations there, their unions, or clubs, aside from the labor union; I mean, now, the communistic or anarchistic organizations?

Mr. WILSON. I know they have them there, but I don't know much of them; no, sir. I know there is a socialistic party that held some meetings, but I am not familiar with it at all.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you seen much of this anarchistic literature? Do you know whether or not that is generally distributed among the foreigners?

Mr. WILSON. Personally I don't know, I have read it in the paper that it has been distributed, but I don't know personally.

Senator STERLING. What do you know of the I. W. W. organization and its existence there?

Mr. WILSON. I have heard it. I have not come in contact with it personally.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all, gentlemen? If so, we are very much obliged to you.

(Whereupon, at 1.20 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the chairman.)

---

PROCLAMATION BY THE SHERIFF OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Whereas I, William S. Haddock, sheriff of Allegheny County, have been formally notified by many citizens, industrial corporations, and employers that printed inflammatory circulars and other information have been distributed and disseminated among the people calling a general strike of all employees of various industrial manufactories throughout Allegheny County, with the request that they cease work and leave their places of employment and by reason thereof there now exists among the people great unrest, uncertainty, and doubt as to the safety of life, liberty, and property: Therefore

I, William S. Haddock, sheriff of Allegheny County, by virtue of the authority vested in me, and the duties imposed upon me by law, do hereby notify all mayors, burgesses, justices of the peace, constables, and policemen, whomsoever they are and wheresoever they may be in Allegheny County, that the primary duty of maintaining public order, preserving the public peace, preserving the rights of all citizens, and protecting all public and private property from loss, injury, or destruction rests upon you, and each of you, and that if any persons shall unlawfully, riotously, and tumultuously assemble together, so as to endanger the public peace, that you must immediately go among said rioters, and then and there make proclamation in the name of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, requiring and commanding all such persons so assembled immediately to disperse themselves and peaceably depart to their habitations or to their lawful business, and if such persons, notwithstanding such proclamation, continue together you are required to immediately cause their arrest and prosecution in the manner prescribed by law.

All peace officers throughout Allegheny County until the present emergency has passed are commanded to disperse and prevent upon the highways or vacant property of all populous sections the loitering or gathering of three or more persons, and whenever such gatherings occur to immediately direct and command such persons to proceed about their lawful business, avocation, or return to their homes and habitations.

Until such emergencies as this shall arise or some unlawful act has been committed, no orderly or peaceable person shall be disturbed or any of his lawful rights infringed upon.

Notice is also given that the law provides that all persons suffering any injury, loss of property, or damages in any manner by reason of the acts of mobs or riotous persons can recover the full value therefor from the County of Allegheny, and that such damages must be paid by the taxpayers and every person responsible therefor.

**RIOT ACT AND PENALTY FOR DESTROYING THIS PROCLAMATION AND REFUSING TO AID THE SHERIFF.**

If any person shall, knowingly, wilfully, and forcibly, obstruct, resist, or oppose any sheriff, coroner, or other officer of the Commonwealth or other person duly authorized, in serving or attempting to serve or execute any legal process whatsoever or shall assault or beat any sheriff, coroner, constable, or other officer or person duly authorized in serving or executing any process or order as aforesaid, or for and because of having served or executed the same; or if any person shall rescue another in legal custody; or if any person, being required by any sheriff, coroner, constable, or other officer of the Commonwealth, shall neglect or refuse to assist him in the execution of his office, in any criminal case, or in the preservation of the peace, or in apprehending and securing any person for a breach of the peace such person shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction be sentenced to imprisonment not exceeding one year, and to pay a fine, not exceeding \$100, or either, or both, in the discretion of the court.—Section 8, act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, approved March 31, 1860, P. L., 386.

If any persons riotously and tumultuously assembled together, to the disturbance of the public peace, shall, unlawfully and with force, demolish or pull down, or destroy, or begin to demolish, pull down or destroy, any public building, private dwelling, church, meeting house, stable, barn, mill, granary, malt house or outhouse, or any building or erection used in carrying on any trade or manufacture, or any branch thereof, or any machinery, whether fixed or movable, prepared for or employed in any manufacture or any branch thereof, or any steam engine or other engine for sinking, working or draining any mine, or any building or erection used in conducting the business of any mine, or any bridge, wagon way, road, or trunk, for conveying minerals from any mine, every such offender shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof shall be imprisoned by separate or solitary confinement at labor, or by simple imprisonment, not exceeding seven years.—Section 20, act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, approved March 31, 1860, P. L., 389.

If any person shall be concerned in any riot, rout, unlawful assembly, or an affray, and shall be thereof convicted, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding \$500, or undergo an imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both, or either, at the discretion of the court; and in case anyone is convicted of an aggravated riot, the court may sentence the offender to imprisonment by separate or solitary confinement at labor, not exceeding three years.—Section 19, act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, approved March 31, 1860, P. L., 389.

Notice is also given that to guard against any and all disturbance of the public peace or interference with the rights of any and all citizens and to protect all property, provision has been made to uphold the law under any and all emergencies which can possibly arise by reason of the acts of any mobs, tumultuous or riotous persons, and that all persons found inciting or encouraging disturbances of the peace or interfering with the rights of any person by any act of commission or omission will be immediately and summarily dealt with in the manner provided by law.

All persons are therefore warned and directed to proceed about their daily avocations with the assurance that life, liberty, and property is fully protected.

In witness whereof I, William S. Haddock, Sheriff of Allegheny County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, have hereunto set my hand this 20th day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and nineteen and the year of this Commonwealth the one hundred and forty-fourth.

WILLIAM S. HADDOCK,  
*Sheriff of Allegheny County.*









Foster's book ??









This book should be returned to  
the Library on or before the last date  
stamped below.

A fine is incurred by retaining it  
beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

APR 24 1965  
**Cancelled**  
588057

3 1965 ILL  
**CANCELLED**  
700-71

**CANCELLED**  
20  
1353-021

FEB 16 1965

**CANCELLED**  
1353-021

